New Jerusalem is my home:

Christian restoration and the discipleship programme

BY

Michael Passetti

Thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Stellenbosch University.

Supervisor: Dr Thomas Cousins

December 2019

Declaration

By submitting this thesis/dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

December 2019

Abstract

I describe the structure of an addiction treatment programme called the discipleship programme and the logic of Christian restoration which informed the programme. The Ark: City of refuge is a homeless shelter located between Mfuleni and the N2, but also houses New Jerusalem which runs the discipleship programme. I conducted participant observation and semi-structured interviews at New Jerusalem between April 2016 and February 2017. I argue that the logic of Christian restoration was characterised by a belief in the possibility of a broken person being restored to the person who they were before they became a broken person. This was achieved through the discipleship programme which provided the student with discipline so that he/she may become a disciplined follower of Jesus Christ, in order to not become a broken person again. I also highlight how Christian restoration was informed not only by Christian discourse, but by a discourse concerned with who the student was as a person coming from a particular social context.

Opsomming

Ek beskryf die struktuur van ’n verslawingsbehandelingsprogram wat as die dissipelskapprogram bekend staan, asook die logika van Christelike herstel wat die program ingelig het. Die *Ark: City of Refuge* is ’n skuiling vir hawelose persone geleë tussen Mfuleni en die N2, maar huisves ook *New Jerusalem*, wat die dissipelskapprogram bestuur. Ek het tussen April 2016 en Februarie 2017 deelnemerwaarneming en semigestruktureerde onderhoude by *New Jerusalem* gedoen. Ek redeneer dat die logika van Christelike herstel gekenmerk word deur ’n geloof in die moontlikheid dat ’n gebroke persoon herstel kan word tot die mens wat hy of sy was voor hy of sy ’n gebroke persoon geword het. Dit word bereik deur die dissipelskapprogram wat die student met die dissipline toerus om hom of haar ’n gedissiplineerde volgeling van Jesus Christus te maak, ten einde nie weer na ’n gebroke persoon terug te keer nie. Ek beklemtoon ook die feit dat Christelike herstel nie alleen deur die Christelike diskoers ingelig word nie, maar ook deur ’n diskoers oor wie die student is as ’n persoon wat uit ’n bepaalde sosiale konteks kom.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Thomas Cousins for his supervision and guidance throughout this process. I really enjoyed our conversations, which were more than mere supervision, but philosophical and fun. Your encouragement kept me going when I thought I could not any more, and I could not have done this without you.

Thank you, Mom and Dad for allowing me the opportunity to do my masters and supporting me throughout. Thank you, Dad for telling me about The Ark in the first place and thank you for the conversations we had which helped me to better understand Christianity.

Thank you, Mom and Melis for putting up with my mood swings throughout this process – I know I can be difficult – but, your caring natures really made this much easier.

I want to thank my sister Justine who has always been a role model for me.

Thank you, friends, who have been there for me during this difficult time.

I want to thank everyone at The Ark, who were extremely welcoming to me and did everything they could to ensure I had a pleasant experience. I appreciate that you allowed a stranger into your home and put up with that stranger for such a long time. This thesis literally could not have happened without all of you.

I also want to thank my dog, Nacho. As weird as it might sound, you were sometimes the only person I could talk to during those endless hours spent at the keyboard. You were a good listener.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

FBO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NGO	Faith-Based Organisation
NJ	New Jerusalem
NJB	New Jerusalem Boys
NJG	New Jerusalem Girls

Introduction

This thesis is concerned with The Ark: City of Refuge and Christian restoration/discipleship. The Ark is a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) which offers Christian-based care and restoration to the public. While this thesis is concerned with The Ark in general as a particular NGO which functions as a shelter for the homeless, it is particularly concerned with a section in the Ark called New Jerusalem (NJ), which is a restoration centre for individuals suffering from addiction and behavioural problems. It is my intention in this thesis to describe and discuss what Christian restoration at NJ entails, as well as describe and discuss how an individual may come to find him/herself at NJ. This will be achieved by detailing the daily lives of individuals at NJ, through conversations and observations I made between April 2016 and February 2017. I will make use of a Foucauldian framework in order to make sense of the discipleship programme, whereby I will focus on how NJ sought to create ethical subjects through an analysis of the discourse of Christian restoration.

In South Africa the government works in partnership with civil society organisations to provide welfare services to the population (Patel, 2008: 73). While the government plays a proactive role in providing social security through old-age pensions, as well as cash payments to the disabled and poor parents (Seekings, 2002: 1), NGOs play a prominent role in filling in the gaps and providing other much needed welfare services, especially in education and health. Furthermore, many of the NGOs providing these services are also FBOs (Burchardt, 2013: 628). The FBO is “a voluntary non-profit organisation, based on the principles of a particular faith, working towards collective goods, embedded in civil society, and modelled along the lines of its secular sibling, the NGO” (Burchardt, 2013: 628). While South Africa has a long history of Christian charitable activity, such activities were largely carried out by the mainline churches (Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic) however recently there has been an increase in the number of Pentecostal FBOs providing these services. The Ark as a Pentecostal FBO belongs to this transnational network of Pentecostal churches and FBOs providing welfare services to poor and vulnerable populations.

The majority of the population of New Jerusalem is made up of poor coloured men and women in their twenties or thirties. The category of coloured as a separate category to

Black, Indian and white emerged in Cape Town around the 1890s (Jensen, 2008: 21). It was given scientific status by a number of commissions: the Wilcocks Commission of Inquiry into the Cape Coloureds in 1937, the Cape Coloured Liquor Commission in 1945 and the Commission of Inquiry into the Deviate Children (Non-European) in 1950 (Jensen, 2008: 21). A common theme among all three of the commissions was the dire circumstances under which the coloured population was living (Jensen, 2008: 22). The Wicocks Commission played an important role in producing the coloured population as a separate category for separate development. The apartheid government's focus on separate development was highlighted by The Group Areas Act of 1950, whereby different spaces were allocated to different legally defined races. A particularly well known example is District Six, where many coloured families were moved out of District Six and into the Cape Flats. There were many dire economic and social consequences for these families.

Steffen Jensen mentions that during apartheid "coloureds were governed differently from Africans, Indians or whites" (2008: 22). In particular, the apartheid government was concerned with what was then termed the 'special problems' of the coloured population, namely the perceived high rates of delinquency and criminality among coloureds (Jensen, 2008: 25). The cause of these problems was partly attributed to a problematic household, which was characterised by an overburdened single mother and an absent alcoholic father (Jensen, 2008: 25). The problem family became the site for government interventions into the coloured population, especially with regards to deterring coloured children from engaging in criminal behaviours, which resulted in the institutionalisation of many coloured children in government schools during the 1940s and 50s (Badroodien, 1999: 63). The investigations and interventions by the apartheid government in part created an image of the coloured population as characterised by delinquency, criminality and alcoholism. This history lives on in the stereotype of the 'skollie', which is "an abstraction of a working-class coloured man who is the embodiment of danger and crime in Cape Town – an urban menace" (Jensen, 2008: 3).

Christian restoration at NJ entailed undertaking a six-month long programme of discipleship, whereby an individual learnt how to be and practiced being a disciple of Jesus Christ or born-again Christian. It was understood by staff member and students that one could overcome their addictions and/or behavioural problems by becoming a born-again Christian. In large part this was due to the discipline that the programme offered, as a lack

of discipline was evoked as one of the reasons for why one had become an addict or engaged in other problematic behaviour, such as gangsterism. Hence, the discipleship programme was concerned with fashioning a disciplined follower of Jesus Christ, so that one may overcome their addictions and/or behaviour problems. Furthermore, in seeking to create the conditions whereby students may become born-again Christians, there were many practices and ideas at NJ that were not completely informed by Christian discourse. There were many discourses at NJ which found coherence in the discipleship programme. In particular there was a concern with the student as a person embedded in a particular social context, which functioned as a justification for many of the disciplinary practices.

Ian Hacking's '*Making Up People*' grapples with the idea of how people are made by the categories that are used to name them. In discussing how this may affect "the concept of the individual person", he states that "making up people changes the space of possibilities for personhood" (2004: 107). The Ark was a place which made up people, in that it divided and segregated people according to categories. NJ was a section which catered to a category of person, i.e. someone who had addiction or behavioural problems. This thesis is concerned with how the students of NJ were 'made up', that is how they were spoken of by others and how they spoke and thought about themselves in order to understand the possibilities of personhood that were open to those in the discipleship programme. Importantly, I want to highlight how even though the discipleship programme was a faith-based treatment programme, many of the ideas related to personhood were not entirely informed by Christian discourse.

In making up the students at NJ there was not only talk about who the students were, but also non-discursive practices which formed an important part of the discipleship programme. These non-discursive practices were largely disciplinary practices, as they sought to order a multiplicity of bodies in order to achieve a certain end (Foucault, 2007: 26). In detailing and discussing the disciplinary practices of NJ I want to highlight how the ways in which student's bodies were manipulated and controlled were indicative of how they were being made up as particular types of persons. While many of the non-discursive practices of NJ were examples of what might be termed 'general' disciplinary techniques, as Foucault discusses in great detail in *Discipline and Punish*, I also want to highlight how these techniques were rationalised through recourse to a discourse which was concerned with personhood. Thus, I am concerned with the discursive and non-discursive practices of the

discipleship programme, as well as the relations between them, in order to acquire an understanding of how the discipleship programme sought to fashion born-again Christians.

Literature Review: Christian restoration as a healing process

In the edited volume, *Addiction Trajectories*, we find a collection of ethnographic essays detailing the myriad ways in which addiction features in the lives of people all over the globe. According to the editors of the collection, Eugene Raikhel and William Garriott, "addiction is particularly relevant as an object of anthropological inquiry because it sits at the crossroads of some of the issues that most define the world today" (2013: 1). One of the issues that they mention is "the role of scientific – and particularly bioscientific – knowledge in the shaping of identity, selfhood and subjectivity" (Garriott & Raikhel, 2013: 1). While this can be considered as something which defines the world today (Rose, 2001) and especially with regards to addiction (Meyers, 2013; Goodfellow, 2008; Vrecko, 2010); it is not the only field which informs contemporary discourses and practices concerned with addiction. In fact, the multitude of ways in which addiction is constructed and dealt with in the contemporary world is something which is highlighted in the *Addiction Trajectories* volume, as Rhaikel and Garriott mention that "The sheer number of available addiction treatments is striking. They range from faith-based treatments rooted in Christian and other religious traditions to Twelve Step programs such as AA and any number of approaches rooted in psychology" (2013: 18). This thesis is concerned with a faith-based approach to addiction treatment, which was largely informed by Pentecostal Christian discourse.

Importantly, for Rhaikel and Garriott, treating addiction as an anthropological object entails being aware of the historical contingency of addiction, while at the same time not disqualifying the experiential reality of addiction, as "such a move forces us to look at this experience in terms of the wider systems of knowledge and practice from which the category of addiction derives its meaning and force" (2013: 26). I treat addiction as a historically contingent category in order to comment on how "wider systems of knowledge and practice" inform the particular practices and ideas associated with the category of addiction at the Ark. The category of addiction has been in one way or another shaped by the fields of science, medicine, religion and law (Garriott & Raikhel, 2013: 26), and it is the field of religion that plays an important role in this thesis. However, while the model of addiction at NJ was largely influenced by Pentecostalism, this was not the only source of

inspiration or sphere of influence. The particular practices and conceptions of personhood were also largely informed by ideas related to who the students were as persons – not in the sense of persons suffering from an illness, but as persons embedded in a particular social context. Thus, the wider systems of knowledge and practice to which I am referring to and which are the concern of this thesis are not primarily those which are commonly figured as informing addiction discourse – such as science, medicine, law and religion, but rather a knowledge of the person embedded in a social context/milieu, in relations with other people, substances and oneself.

In *Healing the exposed being: A South African Ngoma tradition*, Robert Thornton mentions that

> "The individual person, caught in complex nets of relationships with other persons, is the focus of the philosophy and practice of bungoma. It is not simply the person – as 'body', 'spirit' or 'soul' – that the healer attempts to work on and thus to heal, but rather the network of influences that affect the life of the person" (2017: 2).

While Thornton here is discussing a conception of the person that is found in the South African Ngoma tradition, this particular conception of the person is similar to how the student was conceived at NJ. However, there was also a conception of the student as an autonomous rational/moral individual, which is different from the conception of the person as being a "product of other persons" (Thornton, 2017: 2). In *Pharmaceutical Evangelism and Spiritual Capital: An American Tale of Two Communities of Addicted Selves,* Helena Hansen mentions how addiction ministries in Puerto Rico "define addiction as the result of a moral choice rather than a disease" (Hansen, 2013: 110). It is here that we find a concern with the person an autonomous, rational individual who is responsible for and can be held responsible for the choices they make. Yet, Hansen also mentions that

> "The sermons of pastors in addiction ministries centre not on addiction but on the moral degradation rampant across society […] Addiction ministries locate the pathology of addiction not in individual biologies, but in an imagined global society" (2013: 122-123).

Hence, while addiction in addiction ministries in Puerto Rico (as well as at NJ) was constructed as the result of choices that the individual had made ¬– the autonomous, rational, moral individual; it was also constructed as caused by an imagined immoral society,

which influences the individual to become an addict – the individual also becomes an addict through other people. While Hansen does not argue this, by instead focusing on the way in which Evangelical Christianity is largely concerned with the person as a soul, i.e. an individual; I think that the way in which Christianity is also concerned with the individual situated in an immoral society is just as important in trying to understand how NJ sought to heal those categorised as addicts, as I will argue that at NJ it was largely a knowledge of the student as a person embedded in a particular social context that informed their ideas of who an addict is.

In discussing the conception of the person in the South African Ngoma tradition, Thornton also mentions how the work of the healer is better thought of as 'healing' than that of 'curing' an illness, whereas healing is spoken of as "a response to life" rather than "a response to illness or disease" (2017: 2). The work of Christian restoration in that it is concerned with the person embedded in a social context can also be thought of as a "response to life". However, in that Christian restoration is also concerned with the soul of the individual it can also be thought of as a "response to illness or disease", in that such a concern is directed towards something that is part of the individual and not determined by others. In *The clinic and elsewhere: Addiction, adolescents and the afterlife of therapy*, Todd Meyers, drawing on Canguilhem, states that

> "Stated simply, cure is a return whereas healing opens onto something new and previously unfamiliar or unknown. Healing does not restore a previously existing order; it does not return to an old norm. As Canguilhem argues, healing is a process of establishing new norms in and of the body" (2013: 9).

At the time, Canguilhem was arguing against the dominant view of disease as something not normal, that is, disease was viewed as nothing more than a deviation from the normal, healthy functioning individual; and the goal of medicine or cure was to restore the individual to their previous state of wellbeing. Canguilhem brought to our attention the way in which disease is not a deviation from the norm, but rather entailed the establishment of new norms and ways of living; as well as the inherent problems inherited from an understanding of cure as something which restores an individual to a previous state of wellbeing (Canguilhem, 2012: 2-3). The relation between healing and cure is something which Canguilhem discusses in great depth in '*Is a pedagogy of healing possible?'.* In particular, he discusses whether our understanding of cure, as something which is validated according to

external norms, can be reconciled with our understanding of healing, as something which is subjective (Canguilhem, 2012: 17). That is, the patient is not just a passive recipient of the physician's expertise but can make claims on the efficacy of such expertise by recourse to their subjective expectations and experiences of healing. It is interesting that Canguilhem in a way positions healing and cure in opposition to each other, by virtue of one being associated with a return to a previous state of being and the other being associated with the establishment of something new, because at NJ such a distinction was not prevalent. Rather, the discipleship programme and the process of restoration was inherently concerned with restoring the students to a previous state of wellbeing, as well as the establishment of new norms of behaviour. This was an inherent tension found in the practice and identity of being 'born-again'.

I will argue that the process of restoration at NJ and the associated identity of being born-again is at the same time a process whereby one seeks to return to a previous state of being as well as establish themselves as a new person, and in order to think of this process it may be better to speak about the aim of Christian restoration at NJ in terms of the establishment of a different person rather than a new person. In discussing the nature of Christian conversion Joel Robbins highlights the way in which a "disjuncture of temporal continuity" (2007: 12) occurs during conversion. That is "one temporal progression is halted or shattered and another is joined" (2007: 12). While Robbins is discussing time here, I think that we can see how a particular understanding of time – which allows for the possibility of a radical disjuncture between the past, present and future – influences a particular conception of the self and healing, as Robbins mentions "it is this kind of thinking about the possibility of temporal rupture that allows people to make claims for the absolute newness of the lives they lead after conversion" (2007: 12). While Robbins does not explicitly state that the nature of the radical disjuncture in temporal continuity in Christian conversion results in a different person rather than a new person, I will argue that it does because it will allow us to take seriously the concern of Christian restoration at NJ to restore the individual to a previous state of being, as well as the establishment of a new person.

Up to this point I have been discussing the concern of Christian restoration from the point of view of the institution of NJ, but I would now like to turn to why someone would want to undertake a process of restoration. In *The elegiac addict* by Angela Garcia we find an ethnographic study concerned with an individual – Alma – and here trajectory as a heroin

addict. The major themes of this study are that of chronicity and loss. Garcia shows how feelings and memories of loss colour Alma's everyday experiences in a number of ways: The cultural memories of the Hispano people which relate to the loss of land in the Espanola Valley, which cannot and will not easily be forgotten by the immediate presence of the land that was lost; there is the loss of Alma's friend, which is indexed by the material object in remembrance of this loss and there is the loss of sleep that Alma experiences due to heroin withdrawal. Alma attempts to not become "buried" under these memories and feelings by using heroin and another way in which she attempts to do so is to attend services at the Rock Christian Fellowship. She prefers attending services at the Evangelical church because of its focus on the future, rather than attending clinics which perpetuate a chronic model of addiction as its focus on the past made her life unbearable. Garcia goes on to mention that "perhaps it was in evangelicalism and through the promise of being born again that Alma was able to envision putting an end to chronicity as such and to seek for herself a true and lasting recovery" (2013: 55). I think that we will find that the possibility of becoming a different person found in Christian discourse, as a discourse that is opposed to that of the chronicity of addiction as found in other popular addiction treatments, is partly a reason for why one would want to undertake a process of restoration at NJ. Furthermore, it is the promise of becoming a different person, without a past, rather than a new person with a past which allows for one to escape the chronicity of addiction as perpetuated by other addiction discourses.

On the one hand, there is the radical disjuncture of conversion, whereby one becomes a different person by 'being baptised in the Holy Spirit', that is, allowing the Holy Spirit into one's heart. On the other hand, there is also a process that the individual student must undertake, that is, he/she must complete the discipleship programme which is six months long. This process can be thought of as a healing process, in that it consists of the establishment of new norms in and of the body (Meyers, 2013: 9). It can also be thought of as a collection of 'self-processes' as described in *The sacred self* by Thomas Csordas. According to Csordas "self-processes are orientational processes in which aspects of the world are thematized, with the result that the self is objectified, most often as a person with a cultural identity or set of identities" (1997: 5). Csordas's understanding is influenced by the work of Alfred Hallowell who took self-awareness as the basis of the self, whereby the individual is able to "discriminate himself as an object in a world of objects other than

himself" (1955: 75). For Hallowell it was self-awareness which made humans distinctively human and it was the work of culture which taught humans how to become self-aware. Csordas attempts to move out of equating the self with consciousness through embodiment by turning to the work of Bourdieu and Merleau-Ponty. It may be helpful to think of the restoration process as entailing a collection of self-processes, whereby the work of healing is primarily concerned with thematizing the world of the student in particular ways in order to bring about a particular orientation of the student to his/her world. I will argue here that this is in fact what happens in the Ark, in which 'restoration' initiates a process bringing about an objectification of the student by the student, as the student learns and practices a particular way of being-in-the-world.

Thus, this thesis is concerned with NJ and the discipleship programme as a form of addiction treatment. It is a treatment which is informed by Christian Pentecostal discourse, as well as a knowledge of the student as a person embedded in a social context. In this way, we will find that the discipleship programme was concerned with the student as both an autonomous rational/moral individual; as well as a person embedded in complex social relations. We will find that the distinction between cure and healing in terms of either a return to a previous state of wellbeing or the establishment of new norms in and of the body will not adequately explain the process of restoration that the students undertake, as a process of restoration entails both a return to a previous state of being as well as the establishment of new norms in and of the body. Hence, it may be better to think of the process of being a "born-again Christian" as resulting in a different person rather than a new person. In becoming a different person we will find that the discipleship programme is characterised by a collection of self-processes whereby the student is objectified and objectifies him/herself in order to orient themselves to their world in particular ways.

Methodology

The core of this thesis is based on eleven months of fieldwork at The Ark, between April 2016 and February 2017. While I was initially interested in focusing on The Ark as a shelter for the homeless, upon becoming familiar with the institution I decided to focus exclusively on a particular section in the Ark called New Jerusalem. This decision was based on methodological as well as theoretical considerations. Methodologically, I chose to focus on one section because of the sheer size of the Ark, which according to its brochure is home to

roughly eight hundred residents. As it was my intention to acquire an in-depth understanding of particular individual's experiences of the Ark, as well their particular life trajectories, I decided that focusing on one section, instead of multiple sections, would best accomplish this goal. Theoretically, I decided to focus primarily on NJ because I was intrigued by its uniqueness when compared to the other sections of the Ark. This uniqueness owes to its function as a restoration centre for those suffering from addiction and behavioural problems, rather than just a place of temporary or permanent residence, as some of the other sections. I wanted to acquire an understanding of why those categorised as addicts were thought of as individuals in need of Christian restoration, as opposed to temporary or permanent residence, as I think that this will provide valuable insights into how addiction is being constructed in South Africa today. This is not to say that everywhere in South Africa addiction is thought of as it was at NJ, but rather that there was a particular institution in South Africa that constructed addiction in a particular way; the ideas and practices of which were part of a larger discourse found in South Africa today that is concerned with addiction.

In order to acquire an understanding of life in the Ark I spent time with students and staff members as they went about their daily routines, sometimes participating and sometimes not participating, but observing. I had conversations and interviews, and all participants that are mentioned in this thesis have been provided with a pseudonym so as to maintain their anonymity. I also attended a Christmas celebration at the church, where a pastor from the South African Police Service gave a sermon, while another officer sang popular Christmas songs. I spent most of my time with the students in class, in-between classes and after classes, which was when they had "projects" or "duties" to complete. Thus, most of the ethnographic data for this thesis comes from my interactions with the students during these times. Instead of staying at NJ for a limited period of time I chose to visit a few times a week for an extended period of time. This allowed me the opportunity to interact with a lot of different students, but also form relationships with particular students and observe their trajectory through the programme and after. I was able to observe students enter the programme, leave the programme, "fall" and have to start the programme over and finish the programme. Conducting fieldwork in this way I was able to get a feel for and observe the routine of the programme, perhaps the banality of it, but I was also able to observe events which were out of the ordinary, such as the Christmas celebration mentioned above.

Thus, my fieldwork method can be described as a sort of absence-presence, whereby over a period of time I was able to participate in the routine or rhythm of the programme, but also step out of the rhythm and reflect, and then enter into it again.

For Lefebvre (2004: 88), "when rhythms are lived, they cannot be analyzed […] in order to analyze a rhythm, one must get outside it". Yet, in order to feel a rhythm or get a sense of it one must have lived that rhythm, that is, "one must have been grasped by it" (Lefebvre, 2004: 88). In a way, Lefebvre's rhythmanalysis is similar to participant observation, in particular, it is similar to the way in which I conducted participant observation and what I think about the process. By being at NJ I was able to be grasped by the rhythm of everyday life at NJ – I got a "feel for the game" (1990: 66) as Bourdieu describes it. I was able to get a practical sense of what it was like to be at NJ, which at times took on the quality of a "learned ignorance" (Bourdieu, 1990: 102), in that I just did what the other students were doing, which was directed and strategic, yet not something which had to be rationalized in order to be fulfilled. Yet, I was never fully grasped by it (whatever that entails), nor did I intend to be.

I was not a student at NJ for the purpose of completing the discipleship programme. I was a researcher at NJ for the purpose of acquiring an understanding of the discipleship programme. Hence, it was necessary for me to not only go about my time there in a state of learned ignorance, but to also enquire as to why things were the way they were – to try and figure out why the students were doing what they were doing, and at times myself as well. It is here that we can see the double sense of the practice of participant observation, in that it requires a sense of closeness or intimacy with something, and at the same time a sense of distance or reflection. Yet, I do not agree with Bourdieu when he says that "participant observation is in a sense a contradiction in terms" (1990: 34), as it seems to imply that the critical distance involved in participant observation somehow results in one no longer playing the same game that one's participants are playing; that is living according to a practical sense, the sense of which itself is hardly ever explicitly formulated. Rather, the practical sense that comes about through "schemes of perception and appreciation" (Bourdieu, 1990: 13), and the critical distance of participant observation are just different activities that one engages in, perhaps everyone. At times one must be practical and at times one reflects.

While I agree with aspects of both Lefebvre's and Bourdieu's methodological projects, namely the need to live a rhythm or play the game someone else is playing in order to acquire a particular type of knowledge and sense; there is a holism in both Lefebvre and Bourdieu which I do not agree with, or think is necessary to participant observation. It might be termed a holism of experience, whereby one is only able to grasp the logic of practices by being "totally possessed" (Bourdieu, 1990: 14) by them. Yet, what would this possession entail? Becoming a different person? In discussing the emphasis that Robbins places on the experience of conversion – that in researching Pentecostalism one should convert in order to understand the visceral experience of being a born-again Christian, Ruth Marshall questions this assumption. She does not discount the importance of experiencing conversion for oneself and how this could lead to important insights concerning becoming a born-again Christian, but she does question the privileging of it. Whereas for Marshall she was as much interested in the form that Christian witness took than the content of conversion experiences, as Christian witness was a "discursive genre that disciplined the subject to understand and recount her experience in a particular way" (Marshall, 2014: 349).

For Gupta and Ferguson

> "Instead of a royal road to holistic knowledge of 'another society', ethnography is beginning to become recognizable as a flexible and opportunistic strategy for diversifying and making more complex our understanding of various places, people and predicaments through an attentiveness to the different forms of knowledge available from different social and political locations" (1997: 137).

Thus, ethnography isn't about acquiring "holistic knowledge of another society". Considering the discussion above I would also argue that participant observation isn't about having a holistic experience of the place, people or object of study either. Rather, in going to particular locations participant observation is about being attentive to "different forms of knowledge". This does not require one to be "possessed" by what one is doing, but rather just to participate and reflect and be critical of why people are doing and saying such things. However, in arguing for ethnography as an attentiveness to different forms of knowledge, Gupta and Ferguson may be perpetuating an archetype of anthropological fieldwork which they are seeking at the same time to critique. That is, the archetypal distinction between the

'home' as a place of sameness and the 'field' as a place of difference (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997: 123). In fact, the construction or assumption of difference may not only be a methodological problem, but the very epistemological and ethical ground upon which anthropology is based (Marshall, 2014). In conducting fieldwork the field was radically different from my home, and the field never became a home for me. Yet, in speaking about sameness and difference it is important to identify exactly what is being compared, so that one can make a judgement of sameness and difference. NJ was different in comparison to the biomedical conception of addiction and addiction treatment. Yet, it was perhaps not so different from common sense understandings of addiction, and how addicts should be treated, at least in South Africa. Thus, what I present here in this thesis is not the result of someone who collapsed the distinction between home and the field, but rather maintained this distinction throughout fieldwork, in order to not be possessed by the game my participants were playing, and keep a critical distance. The discursive and non-discursive practices of NJ can also be thought of as entailing a form of knowledge from a particular place and time, which was not only unique to the institution but also reflected and grappled with a broader debate concerned with addiction and religion.

Chapter layout

This thesis is made up of two parts. In the first part of the thesis (chapters 1-3) I focus on the particular practices of NJ; in the second part (chapters 4-6) I focus on the discourse of NJ. It is structured in this way to reflect the sensibilities of the institution. At NJ there was a concern with not only what the students did but with how and why they did it, that is the institution was concerned with their motivations for doing certain things as well as with the ways in which the students thought and spoke about themselves. On the one hand, there were the practices that the students were required to engage in, which in the eyes of the institution were largely responsible for giving the student a sense of responsibility – a practical sense of a particular lifestyle. Yet, merely performing such responsibilities was not evidence of change, the institution was also concerned with initiating an inner change in the student, which was indexed not so much by the actions of the students, but by the way in which the students thought and spoke about themselves and others.

In chapter one I introduce the reader to the space and time of NJ. I describe the physical space that NJ consisted of and the timetable that students had to follow. I describe the

positioning and movement of the students before and during classes. It is here that we find how NJ sought to manipulate and control a multiplicity through distributing individual bodies in space and time. Yet, I also want to show how NJ was concerned with the individual body of the student itself, that is with the gestures of the individual students. I will show that there was a concern with the gaze of the student, as the gaze was thought of as indexing inner states. In this case the gaze of the student was thought to index a state of desire: a desire for someone else or a desire to learn. I refer to Foucault's discussion of particular disciplinary techniques in *Discipline and punish* in order to show how the particular practices of NJ can be thought of as 'general' techniques of discipline, but I also want to highlight how these 'general' techniques were informed by particular ideas that NJ had of the students as particular types of persons.

In chapter two I describe the activity of students in-between classes. I focus on two particular spaces where students would hang out in-between classes: the square and the coffee bar. Whereas in the first chapter we find a particularly visible form of discipline in that students were often told what to do – how and where to position their bodies and gazes – in this chapter we find a less visible form of discipline, in that in-between classes at the square and the coffee bar students were mostly not told what to do by an authority figure. Yet, the lack of presence of an authority figure did not mean that these places did not function as 'disciplinary spaces'. Here I discuss a more subtle and less visible form of discipline that was at work at NJ. I highlight the way in which this aspect of discipline functioned according to the mechanism of 'panopticism', whereby students would become the subjects of their own and other students' subjection. I discuss how behaviours interpreted as '*skarreling'* were frowned upon by students in order to show how a mechanism of 'normalization' was at work in NJ.

In chapter three I describe the activity of students during 'projects' or 'duties'. The performance of projects for NJB students and duties for NJG students was another aspect which formed a large part of the discipleship programme, which largely entailed the performance of some sort of manual labour. I discuss how both the NJB and the NJG students had different views of the work that they had to perform, as the NJB students were largely satisfied with the work that they had to perform and the NJG students were largely dissatisfied with the work that they had to perform. While so far, I have discussed disciplinary space it is here that I will focus on 'disciplinary time'. I argue that the principle of

the use of time that characterised projects and duties was one of non-idleness rather than that of the exhaustive use of time. I argue that the projects and duties that students had to perform was primarily directed towards keeping their bodies busy so that their minds would be busy as well, to limit the possibility of dangerous thoughts from occurring.

In chapter four I describe the way in which students were spoken about and spoke about themselves as particular types of addicts. Important to this discussion is the idea that addicts lack discipline, and hence are in need of discipline, which is why they are at NJ. I will discuss how the lack of discipline which was spoken about entailed a lack of an ability to perform one's responsibilities – particularly those of one's responsibility towards one's family and work. Furthermore, the students themselves had ideas of themselves as particular types of addicts, which came through in their comparisons between NJ as a restoration centre with that of a rehabilitation centre. Through these comparisons we come to find that NJ was largely contrasted with a rehab in terms of both depth and effort. Important to this discussion will be the relation between personhood and care, as the students spoke about themselves as requiring a form of care based on the type of person they were.

In chapter five I discuss how students spoke about themselves not as addicts but as "broken" people. While students did speak about themselves as particular types of addicts, the addict to which they were referring to is the person they were before coming to the Ark. Once the student enters NJ they are no longer an addict, but an ex-addict or a 'broken person'. In this chapter I will discuss what it is to be a broken person, or how students spoke about how they became a broken person. Primarily, we will find that the student became a broken person by conforming to what was occurring around them. It is here that we will find the preoccupation with 'society' as an immoral place, and the problem of addiction is not, as was the case in the last chapter, primarily the fault of the individual but the result of living in an immoral society. Yet, we also find a concern with the way in which the individual has a choice of whether to conform to what is occurring around them, which is why being an addict is also construed as a choice.

In chapter six I discuss what it is to be "born-again" at NJ. Important to this discussion are the ideas concerned with how undertaking a process of restoration might help someone who was once an addict. Primarily we find that in becoming a born-again Christian, one now has the power of the Holy Spirit, which allows one to resist temptation. Whereas in the

previous chapter I mention how the student was spoken of as becoming a broken person by conforming to what was occurring around them, they now have the power to not conform. Furthermore, I discuss the rationality behind the segregation of male and female students, as well as the life of students at the Ark after the programme which was characterized by the opportunity to have an intimate relationship with a member of the opposite gender if they wanted. The focus in this chapter on relationships is due to the emphasis that NJ itself placed on the risks and rewards of intimate relationships. I take the concern with intimate relationships to be a strong indicator of one of the primary causes of becoming a broken person according to NJ's concept of addiction, and hence something to protect oneself from.

Chapter 1: The classroom

In this chapter I introduce the reader to the structure of the discipleship programme, with emphasis on the daily routine of NJ students. I focus on how discipline is imposed on the student through particular disciplinary techniques: the timetable, the use of space, surveillance, examination, punishments and rewards. I discuss how discipline functions as a technology of domination in order to make students into 'docile bodies', which can be manipulated and controlled. I will highlight how there was a concern with controlling a mass of bodies, as well as a concern with controlling the gestures of individual bodies. In particular, there was a concern with the gaze of the student. The gaze was understood to be an index of one's inner dispositions and as such an important indicator of the inner world of the student. While the manipulation of bodies before and during classes was merely a way of getting students to class on time, it was also a way of preventing contact between NJB and NJG students. In this way, the discipline of the classroom served a practical purpose – to get the students to class on time, but it also served another purpose – to limit contact between NJB and NJG students, which was perhaps not solely done for practical reasons, but rather a knowledge of the who the students were as persons.

The discipleship programme: Time, space and structure

First, I will describe the space and then the timetable. NJ is divided into two different sections: New Jerusalem Boys (NJB) and New Jerusalem Girls (NJG). As you can tell by the name, NJB provides residence to male students and NJG provides residence to female students. Residence entails a place to sleep, eat and shower, as well as a locker to keep one's valuables. While there is much to say about the segregation between male and female students, for now I want to bring to attention the different spaces of NJB and NJG. NJB and NJG are located in different spaces. NJG shares the same building with the single ladies and frail care sections. It consists of a singular rectangular building with a cement courtyard in the middle. This is the same architecture as the other sections. NJB, however, consists of three separate buildings, which are poisoned in such a way as to create a rectangular shape, with a garden and cement square in the middle. The three buildings of NJB are positioned so

that they make up three sides of a rectangle, whereas the fourth side is open. There are also cement walkways that wind through the garden, with cement benches along the sides of the paths. I spent much of my time with students in the 'square' as it was called. The NJG section is directly opposite the NJB section. The NJ section, that is, both NJB and NJG are found at the back of the Ark – furthest away from the front gate.

Now, the timetable. The day begins early, at 05:00 the student wakes up. At around 05:30 the students do a Jericho March, also known as a 'prayer walk', which entails the students walking around the circumference of the Ark's premises praying. This is modelled on the march that Joshua did around the circumference of Jericho. Then it is devotions, which entails time alone between oneself and God. After devotions it is breakfast, followed by duties for NJG or projects for NJB. Projects and duties are responsibilities that students are expected to perform, and largely entails some form of manual labour. For the students of NJG it largely entails attending to domestic work, and for the NJB students it largely entails working outside, like gardening and repairing parts of the Ark. At 08:00 classes start, which run until 12:00. There are three different classes, as well as three different phases of classes. The different phases are elementary, disciple and outreach. From 12:30 to 14:30 it is duties and projects. After duties around 15:00 it is shower time. Supper time is 17:00, followed by more duties and devotions. At 21:00 it is quiet time, whereby students need to be in their beds. At 22:00 it is lights out.

We can see here that the daily routine or timetable of NJ students is largely centred around three activities: 1) devotions, whereby students are expected to spend time alone with God, either in prayer or reading scripture; 2) attending classes, whereby students learn about scripture, and how to be a disciple of Jesus Christ, and 3) projects or duties whereby students are expected to perform particular responsibilities, which largely involves some form of manual labour. Another activity may be added to this list, that of attending church services, which can be thought of a time of collective worship and learning. Yet, this occurs on the weekends. While I was unable to observe students while undertaking their devotions, I was able to observe and participate in the classroom, in-between the classes and during projects/duties.

The discipleship programme is a six month long, four phase programme according to the information document that is provided to the prospective student and/or the person

responsible for bringing the individual to NJ. Phase one is detox or observation and is three days in duration. The student does not attend classes or partake in any of the other activities of the programme. This time is meant for the student to detox from any substances that they were using prior to coming to NJ. The second phase is called 'elementary school'. According to the information document, it is here that the student is introduced to routine and obedience. The second phase is called 'disciple school'. It is here that the student is trained in routine and discipline, and obedience is stressed throughout this period. The last phase is called 'outreach school'. At this stage of the programme the student is expected to have learned responsibility and is starting to learn to complete what s/he has started. Each successive phase after detox is about two months in length, which results in a six month long programme. Hence, we find an emphasis on routine, obedience, discipline and responsibility. These four principles inform the structure and content of the discipleship programme and can be thought of as four types of dispositions that the programme seeks to instil in the students.

While the above description provides information as to how the different phases of the programme are structured according to the Ark, I would like to describe how I came to understand the different phases though my participation in them. Elementary school is primarily aimed at providing the student with a basic introduction to the structure of the bible. It is here that the student learns and must memorize the different books of the bible as well their location within the bible, so that s/he may easily find a particular verse that may be the topic of discussion in the classroom. It also entails a basic introduction to the content of the bible, with emphasis on what it is to be a disciple of Jesus Christ. In disciple class, there is more emphasis on coming to terms or discussing what it is to be a disciple. Whereas in elementary school, the student is thought to be largely ignorant of what it is to be a disciple, and thus is more directed towards teaching the student what it entails, in disciple school, there is more of an emphasis on applying these teachings to one's life, in a general sense. Finally, in outreach school there is an emphasis on how one may be a disciple once they leave the Ark. Up until this point the focus has been on the present, whereas in outreach school the student is expected to think about their future.

Interestingly, this phase is called outreach because it used to entail going out of the Ark in order to perform evangelical work, but this no longer occurs, yet the name has remained.

Hence, in elementary one receives knowledge, in disciple school one reflects on that knowledge and in outreach school one is supposed to apply that knowledge through evangelism, but now does so though discussing with others what it is to be a disciple. Importantly, while there are different points of emphasis in each phase, this does not mean that in each class there are only activities associated with that emphasis. Rather, learning, reflection and application are activities that occur at every phase. Much like how routine, obedience, discipline and responsibility are present at every phase of the programme.

Attending class: The manipulation of bodies

Now that I have provided an overview of the different phases of classes, I would like to describe the process that students go through in order to get to their classes. The class does not really begin at 08:00, but fifteen minutes before 08:00 in the 'square'. The square, as it is called by the students, is a cement square in the middle of NJB, surrounded by benches. I spent a lot of time with students in the square and one can find them there before, after and in-between classes, or at any other time when they are not busy with the demands of the programme. I suppose it can be categorized as a sort of recreational space, where students hang out. It is a place where students smoke cigarettes, converse and sometimes play a game of hand tennis. I remember the first time I attended a class, I arrived early, about 07:30 and found the students gathered together at the square. Everyone was wearing their formal attire: button up shirts with a tie, formal pants and shoes. Students have to wear formal attire to class. I, on the other hand, was wearing a shirt and jeans. I would have actually arrived even earlier but I had spent a considerable amount of time grappling with the idea of whether I should or should not wear formal attire. In the end I chose not to. I did not know whether I was expected to wear formal attire or if that might be taken as an insult, because I was not really in the programme. Anyway, the students are gathered in the square, in their best clothing, conversing and smoking their last cigarettes before they have to head into class.

At around 08:00, but not precisely any time before 08:00, the students start dividing. Those who are in elementary begin to line up outside of the 'chapel', which is where elementary class is held; it is also the place where students eat their meals. Those who are in disciple school move towards the NJB office, where they stand in single file. Finally, those who are in outreach make their way to a room which has no name, but nevertheless is the place where

they have outreach class, which is situated just opposite of the chapel. Once everyone is in their assigned positions, they are led into the classrooms by a monitor. A monitor is someone who has completed the discipleship programme and has decided to stay at the Ark for some reason. I will discuss this in more detail later, but it is important to note here that the monitor is higher up on the hierarchy than the student and is responsible for monitoring students' behaviour. Those who are in elementary are led, by the monitor, in single file into the chapel. Those who are in disciples are led by a monitor into their classroom which is situated in the NJG section or more precisely, in the single ladies section. Those who are in outreach are allowed to walk into the classroom at their own pace. Once in the classroom, the NJB students take their designated seats, which in elementary and disciples is situated at the front of the classroom and in outreach is situated on the left-hand side of the classroom, if one faces the room from the front. In elementary it is the NJB students that enter the classroom first, in the disciples class it is the NJG students that enter the classroom first; in the outreach class there is no order as to which section enters the classroom.

This controlled and directed positioning and movement of bodies is an important aspect of discipline. It is a way of ordering and manipulating a multiplicity, so as to ensure obedience and docility. In short, it is a technique for achieving a certain end, which in this case is to get individual students to their class on time. However, there is also another aspect to this carefully orchestrated dance of bodies, which becomes apparent once one is in the classroom and is aware of the prohibitions of the programme. In order to illustrate this other aspect I would to describe what occurs once the students have taken their seats. In elementary class, once the NJB students have taken their seats, there is a moment of pause. Then, the monitor signals to the students, "*sak jou koppe manne*" [lower your heads], or "*sak*" or just "*nou manne*" [now guys]. This signal is given when the monitor can see the NJG students making their way from their section. Upon hearing this, the NJB students bow their heads, so that their attention is directed towards the floor. The monitor does not lower his or her head, but rather looks straight ahead at nothing. The NJG students make their way in single file from their section through the NJB section, and into the classroom. They take their seats in their assigned positions, behind that of the NJB students. This time there is no signal given by the monitor, but all the NJB students know that they are now allowed to lift their heads, which they do. The NJB students cannot see the NJG students and the NJG

students can only see the backs of the NJB students. The teacher takes roll call, and then the class begins. At the end of the class, the NJB students must bow their heads again, until the NJG students are no longer visible from the classroom.

We can see here that the directed positioning and movement of individual bodies serves the function of ordering and manipulating a mass of bodies. This is an example of what in *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault calls "the art of distributions" (1975: 141). It is an art of distributing individual bodies in space, an important aspect of discipline (1975: 141). It is also an art of economy, in that its aim is "to derive the maximum advantages and to neutralize the inconveniences" (1975: 142). It is a way of creating an efficient machine. In speaking of 'disciplinary space' Foucault says

> "It is spaces that provide fixed positions and permit circulation; they carve out individual segments and establish operational links; they mark places and indicate values; they guarantee the obedience of individuals, but also a better economy of time and gesture" (1975: 148).

Foucault also mentions three ways in which bodies are distributed in disciplinary space: 'cells', 'places' and 'rank'. The way in which the bodies of NJ students are manipulated in attending classes contains all three of these techniques. For Foucault, "the disciplinary space is always, basically, cellular" (1975: 143). While the cell largely relates to a space of confinement, it can also be thought of an individual space "each individual has his own place, and each place is individual" (1975: 143). This is evident by the way in which individuals have their own space in the classroom. I am referring here to the way in which NJB and NJG students have their own individual spaces, in that both NJB and NJG students each represent a particular type of individual respectively. The segregation of NJB and NJG students is an example of the way in which discipline works to 'partition' different types of individuals, in order to, as mentioned earlier, increase the efficiency of the machine or system, by "preventing dangerous communications" (1975: 143). Yet, disciplinary space is not only about segregating individuals, but also about making a useful space.

Discipline seeks to assign particular functions to particular spaces. This is evident by the way in which there are different spaces for different classes. Yet, it is interesting that at NJ, some spaces serve many functions, such as the chapel. The chapel is not only a space of learning but serves other functions as well. NJB students eat their meals in the Chapel, as well as

have devotions. During mealtimes students are allowed to converse, yet during devotions it is different. I was made aware of this when a student told me that he was punished for shouting “devotions!” in the chapel, during the time that it was devotions. While different functions are assigned to different spaces, it is more important that one be aware of exactly what the space is being used for, so as to act accordingly. Perhaps, the example of the student shouting ‘devotions’ during devotions in the chapel is an example of the importance of having different functions assigned to different spaces in order to allow for the invisible, efficient functioning of discipline to occur.

It is interesting that Foucault should mention ‘rank’ as a way of distributing individuals in space, as rank is not so much about distributing individuals in physical space, as it is about distributing individuals in relation to each other. According to Foucault

> “Discipline is an art of rank, a technique for the transformation of arrangements. It individualizes bodies by a location that does not give them a fixed position, but distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations” (1975: 146).

However, I think it is important to mention, that rank is in a way about positioning individuals in physical space. At NJ there is evidence of this by the way in which the monitors and students occupy different physical spaces. Before entering the classroom, the monitor does not stand in line with the students but stands apart from them in order to observe them. In the classroom the monitor does not sit with the students but sits apart from them, again, so that he may observe them. Yet, the importance of rank is that it brings to attention that, even in distributing individuals in physical space, discipline is primarily concerned not with providing individuals with a fixed position, but with situating individuals in ‘a network of relations’ with other individuals and things. This is why “in organizing ‘cells’, ‘places’ and ‘ranks’ the disciplines create complex spaces that are at once architectural, functional and hierarchical” (1975: 148). It is ‘architectural’ by the way in which individuals are assigned particular spaces. It is functional by the way in which particular spaces become useful spaces and it is hierarchical by distributing individuals in a network of relations. It is important to note that Foucault speaks of disciplinary space as being both “real” and “ideal”.

According to Foucault (1975: 148), when discussing disciplinary space, “they are mixed spaces: real because they govern the disposition of buildings, rooms, furniture, but also

ideal, because they are projected over this arrangement of characterizations, assessments, hierarchies". The material aspect of discipline at NJ is related to way in which individuals, as well as objects, are distributed in relation to each other, what I take Foucault to mean by 'real' here. Yet, the distribution of individuals in space is not only based on what is most efficient, but what is most ideal. This refers to another one of the great functions of discipline which is to create an "analytical space" (1975: 143). One the one hand, while the manipulation and positioning of NJ students before and during class, is a way of ensuring the most efficient use of time and gesture, it is also a way of organizing individuals in space based on a number of assessments of who those individuals are thought to be. Namely, NJB students are thought of as particular types of individuals and persons, and NJG students are thought of as particular types of individuals and persons, which is why they are kept separate from each other. There are practical reasons for why things are the way they are and ideological reasons as well. It is interesting that Foucault mentions the manipulation of gesture and as the above example alludes to, the manipulation of gesture is an important as aspect of discipline at NJ.

Manipulating the gaze: The danger of the face

It is important to note that the classroom is one of the only places where NJB and NJG students share a common space, as they do not mix in-between classes or during projects/duties. This is important to note because we see that discipline at NJ does not only involve the manipulation of whole bodies in space, but the manipulation of gestures as well. For NJ, it is sufficient enough to have NJB and NJG students occupy different spaces, but there are further measures put in place which work on the level of the individual's body itself. It is not sufficient enough that NJB students should line up and enter the classroom separately, but that they are also required to avert their gaze from the NJG students if they are in the same space. Foucault does speak about the correlation of body and gesture in *Discipline and Punish*, in particular he mentions how the disciplines sought to create "the best relation between a gesture and overall body position" (1975: 152), which in some cases entailed a preoccupation with the smallest of bodily postures. This, as the distribution of individuals in space, is also an art of economy, in that it seeks to create the most efficient relation possible. This may be an aspect of what is happening in the classroom, in that it is economic, because it limits the possibility of 'dangerous communications'. Yet, the way in which the possibility of communication is lessened is fascinating, because there is

something about the gaze, and in particular, looking at another in the face that informs this practice. The way in which communication between NJB and NJG students is limited by preventing one another from looking at each other in the face speaks to a particular understanding of intersubjectivity.

On the one hand, the way in which NJB and NJG students are prevented from having face to face contact seems to be merely an efficient way of positioning bodies so that communication cannot occur – if one cannot see another then communication is difficult to achieve. On the other hand, there is a sensibility here that face to face contact produces something that in this case is undesirable, or perhaps it is something that is desirable, which is the reason why it is prohibited. In order to illustrate this point I would like to bring to the reader's attention a sign that hangs on the wall of the NJB office, which reads "Job 31:1:1, I made a covenant with my eyes not to look lustfully at a young woman", signed PS Janet, which stands for Pastor Janet[1]. NJB students are prohibited from interacting with NJG students in order to prevent communication, but they are also prohibited from even looking at NJG students because of the possibility of lust that it might incite within them. In fact, the quoted passage above does not quite get at exactly what is occurring at NJ, because it is not about not looking lustfully at a young woman, but not looking at a young woman at all, so as to prevent lecherous thoughts from ever occurring. I think there is a distinction between looking at someone or something the right way, and not looking at someone or something at all, because of something perhaps incontrollable that may occur.

Besides the practice of ignoring the Other, which seems to be the preferred way of dealing with the Other at NJ, there is something more to be said about the way in which it is done, that is, an aversion of the gaze. Can it be that there is some unique quality about face to face contact? For Emmanuel Levinas, encountering the face of another person is exactly that, it is an encounter, an 'interruption'. The face-to-face encounter 'summons' a sense of responsibility for another person. In discussing this aspect of Levinas' philosophy, Sean Hand writes

> "My presence before the face is therefore an epiphany. It creates an asymmetrical indebtedness on my part towards the Other's moral summons which is based not on a prior knowledge […], but on the primacy of the other's right to exist" (Hand, 1989:

[1] Pastor Janet is one of the founders of the Ark, and at the time of fieldwork was still living at The Ark.

5).

Levinas is not concerned with what happens in the psychology of an individual when they encounter the face of another person, but rather, he is concerned with the phenomenology of intersubjectivity. That is, what occurs on a preconscious level, before conscious reflection. He argues, that on the preconscious level the face of the Other, is felt as a summons to be moral. In this way, preventing face to face contact, can be thought of as an appropriate way of preventing something that the individual is thought to have no control over, because the face of the Other is an interruption that is felt on the preconscious level. In this case, the unwanted effect of face to face contact is lust, which is prevented from happening by preventing face to face contact, because the face of another summons one to act in a particular way. While for Levinas, the face of the Other summons one to be moral, we find here that the face of the Other summons one to be immoral.

The pedagogy of the classroom

Once all the bodies are in position and accounted for, the lesson begins. The lessons are normally given by supervisors[2]. In the chapel, the supervisor takes his or her position behind the pulpit, which stands at the front of the class. Each class is concerned with a theme, for instance, the particular class I wish to discuss was an elementary class, and the theme was 'baptism with the Holy Spirit'. I do not wish to discuss the content of the lesson here, but rather focus on the 'formal' aspects; that is, the way in which classes are conducted. I want to specifically focus on the activities of the teacher and students. First, I will describe the pedagogy of the teacher and then I will describe the activities of the students.

In order to describe the pedagogy of the teacher I would like to focus on a specific supervisor and class. The specific supervisor I call Peter and the class was elementary. The theme of this particular class was 'baptism with the Holy Spirit'. Peter spoke in a loud voice, almost deafening at times, and was rather animated with his body. On one instance he hit the bible rather hard in order to emphasise his point that the bible is substantial and not insubstantial; on another occasion he acted out someone who had been touched by the Holy Spirit, as well as someone who was pretending to pray, but did not know how to pray properly. It was a mix of preaching and teaching. His authority was secured by his

[2] Supervisors are individuals who have completed the discipleship programme and bible school. They are higher up in the hierarchy than both students and monitors, but lower than the pastors.

authoritative tone, almost lashing out with his words, which the residents licked up with their attentive stares. Yet, he was also light-hearted and funny. He made many jokes, including the one above, when he described and performed someone praying the wrong way or pretending to be touched by the Holy Spirit; while these performances were meant to be taken seriously, they were performed in a comical way, and had many of the students laughing. This light-hearted side of his pedagogy made him more entertaining, but also approachable. Students asked him many questions throughout the lesson, and he always seemed to welcome these questions, and of course always seemed to have an answer for these questions. Overall, he created an impression of an authority to listen too, but also a light-hearted person who welcomed questions.

His authority was not only secured by his position on the pulpit and his loud voice and kind manner, but also by his knowledge of the bible. The majority of the lesson consisted of him referencing a verse of the bible which would then be discussed. Either he would read the verse or ask one of the students to read the verse. The verse would then be explained and students would have the opportunity to ask questions about it or anything else that was on their mind. One verse would lead to the next and were all connected in some way to speak to the particular topic that the class was concerned with. This created an impression of a keen knowledge of scripture, although it must be said that the lessons, and the particular verses which are referenced have already been assembled beforehand, as all lessons were written by Pastor Janet. Where the supervisor's knowledge of scripture, hence authority, was really displayed was in the answering of questions by referencing particular verses. For example, during the lesson one of the students asked the supervisor, "what if I love Jesus so much that I get a tattoo of him?" to which the supervisor responded that he should not do that because that would just return him to "bondage". However, upon saying this, a lot of the students seemed quite concerned because most of them already had tattoos. Upon realizing this, the supervisor told the students that they should not be concerned with the past but rather concentrate on their future, and to add weight to this claim he referenced Philippians 3:13[3]. This situation is quite illustrative of the atmosphere of the classroom, where students would ask the supervisor for advice about how to live their lives and the supervisor's response would be taken quite seriously and bible verses interpreted quite literally. I would now like to turn to the activities of the students.

[3] "Brothers, I do not consider myself yet to have taken hold of it. But one thing I do: Forgetting what is behind and straining toward what is ahead" (NIV)

In the classroom, students are equipped with a notebook, pen or pencil and a bible. The notebook is particularly important in elementary class, as students must pass a written examination after their first fifty days in order to move onto the next phase of classes. Students are expected to write down what the supervisor says unless instructed by the supervisor otherwise. Students are also expected to be able to find verses in the bible as they are uttered by the supervisor, in order to read out loud if they are instructed by the supervisor or to read silently as it is read by the supervisor or another student. The activity of the student largely entailed a hurried searching of the pages of the bible for the verse that was being referenced. It was quite comical at times, as sometimes the supervisor would utter different references in rapid succession which would then cause the students to frantically search for verses to not lag behind. I tried my best to keep up with the frantic pace, and was rather impressed that I was able to find some of the verses with relative ease, something I attribute to my own training I received in Sunday School as a child, where we were taught the books of the bible as a song so as to easily remember all of them. On other occasions however I would be unable to find the verse and would resign myself to just listen.

It is an activity which is supposed to get student to memorize the different locations of the different books of the bible, so that the student may easily find the particular verses that are referenced throughout the lesson. It is also about memorizing particular verses so that the student may incorporate it into their lives outside of the classroom. The routine of attending classes, as well as devotions, whereby students are involved in reading and memorizing scripture is about creating in the student a desire for studying scripture, as the supervisor told the students “you should study the bible every day and night, diligently”. Diligently is an important word here because any lack of concentration was punished in the classroom, as anyone who was seen to be falling asleep would have to stand up for the remainder of the class.

Reading and writing also serves an important disciplinary and analytical function. Of course, the written examination of the elementary class is an important example of this. Yet, there were other ways in which reading itself served an analytical function and writing became a punishment. During an interview I had with Peter, I asked him whether many of the students struggled with writing and reading, and whether this might bar someone from progressing in the programme. He told me that many of the students are illiterate, but he

did not think that this would prevent them from progressing. Rather, he told me that the problem with illiterate students is that one does not know whether they are actually trying. With literate students one can observe them reading and writing and be assured that they are actually trying to do something about their situation, that is, for the supervisor, their reading and writing is evidence of an inner disposition, which the supervisor calls an "attitude" – that they are willing to try. Yet, for Peter it is impossible to tell whether a student has this attitude if they are illiterate, because the illiterate student can just sit there and "there's static behind your eyes and nobody's going to know", whereas with the literate student the supervisor can observe if they are not reading or writing, that is, trying.

Conclusion: The body, perception and subjectivity

In the classroom, as well as those moments directly preceding the classroom, we find a preoccupation with the ordering of a multiplicity through the control and manipulation of individual bodies in space (and time). This ordering works at the level of distributing whole bodies in space, as is seen by the way in which individual students are assigned individual spaces before and during the class. It also works at the level of the individual body itself, as is seen by the way in which the student's body position and gaze is manipulated. There is a sensibility that the gaze of the student correlates with the inner disposition of the student. That is, there is a concern with manipulating and analysing the gaze of the student in order to find out what is going on inside the student, as well as to prevent and bring about inner dispositions. However, as the example of the illiterate student illustrates, discipline that is only concerned with analysing and manipulating observable practices may still be blind to the inner world of the student and unable to shape that world. This world, according to Peter, is characterised by an attitude which for him was something that the discipline of the programme could not affect.

It is interesting that for Peter the discipline of the programme could not affect the attitude of the student, as it assumes a distinction between mind and body – a Cartesian dualism. For Peter, the discipline of the programme worked on the body of the student, that is it provided the student with a routine, but it did not work on the attitude of the student, which was something only the student could affect. Furthermore, there was no casual connection between mind and body for Peter, as the discipline worked on the body of the student, and the student worked on their attitude, without any direct influence between

them. In light of this we find that even though the discipline of the programme was unable to directly change the students' attitude, it was concerned with controlling and analysing the attitude. That is why there was a concern with the gaze and perception of the student, as it was something that could be controlled and analysed, at least with reference to an 'ideology of inner reference', whereby there was thought to be a correlation between the student's perception and their subjectivity.

Chapter 2: In-between classes

When NJB students were not busy with the demands of the programme they could be found in the 'square' or if they were in the security section at the 'coffee bar'. As I mentioned earlier the square is a cement square located in the middle of the NJB section. The coffee bar is a room with a wooden bar table and couches, which is located at the front of the Ark, by the security section. Both places can be thought of as places of recreation, where students would hang out between classes if they were in NJB or between shifts if they were in security. However, while they may have been places of recreation, this does not mean that they did not function as disciplinary spaces as well. In this chapter I highlight the way in which there was a more subtle form of discipline in spaces and at times of recreation than what one found in the classroom. I will then relate this subtle form of discipline to a discussion of 'disciplinary normalization' and how such normalization occurred at NJ.

The square: A panoptic arrangement

I spent many hours with the NJB students in the square. Between 08:00 and 12:00 there are three classes, with twenty-minute breaks in-between. In-between classes NJB students hang out in the square. It is here that they converse, smoke cigarettes and play hand tennis. It is a space of recreation. However, it is also a disciplinary space. I became aware of this on one occasion when I was sitting with a group of students, not in the square but just outside the square, by the washing lines. I was speaking with a new student who was upset about being punished for shouting "devotions!" in the chapel; but I was also listening to another conversation which was occurring just next to me about the number gangs: "the number is not the same anymore, the real number was in the 90's" and "drugs, gangsterism, it all comes from the same place". I was rather enjoying listening to this conversation when a monitor, everyone called "Lurch", because he was very tall and moved very slowly, came over and told us that we need to move back to the square. At that time, I did not know that students were required to stay in the square and thought that they just chose to hang out there. After this incident I realized that between classes the monitors did not hang out in the square with the other students but stood or sat along the circumference observing them. I then realized that my lack of awareness of this may have been due to the way in

which the square was designed, with benches along the perimeter facing inwards towards the centre of the square which guide one's attention towards the centre of the square. The way the square is constructed makes any attempt to look outwards an effort, although not impossible; it keeps the student's gaze directed towards the interior. Whereas I always thought that residents gathered at the square spontaneously and because they wanted to, it became apparent to me that it might not be as spontaneous as I thought.

While the discipline of the classroom, the way in which individual bodies were controlled and manipulated, is an example of a particularly visible form of disciplinary practice; the discipline of the square, and other areas outside of the classroom, sought to control individuals in a more subtle and less visible way. It was more subtle because, unlike the classroom, there seemed to be no authority figure instructing the students what to do; and the students seemed to be organizing themselves spontaneously. Yet, it is as one of the students told me that "there's nothing natural here"[4]. The illusion of spontaneity is actually a carefully orchestrated subtle coercion. In fact, the way in which things seem 'natural' is an important aspect of discipline, which is captured by the term 'panopticism' which Foucault discusses in *Discipline and Punish*. Panopticism is derived from Jeremy Bentham's panopticon which is an architectural arrangement, consisting of a circular building with cells along the periphery and a singular watchtower in the centre, thus allowing for those in the cells to be constantly visible from the watchtower, and always assuming that they are being watched. The term panopticism refers to a more general mechanism of defining power relations, a mechanism of disciplinary power. It is a mechanism for making discipline more efficient by making the individual the subject of their own subjection, by making the individual assume that he/she is always being watched. Yet, panopticism is not just about acting a certain way because one feels that they are constantly being observed, it is about (as discipline functions according to Foucault), making discipline efficient by making the individual the subject of their own subjection, as according to Foucualt

> "In short, it [panopticism] arranges things in such a way that the exercise of power is not added on from the outside, like a rigid, heavy constraint, to the functions it invests, but is so subtly present in them as to increase their efficiency by itself increasing its own point of contact" (1975: 206).

[4] The student told me this when I told him that I was unsure of whether I should use my voice recorder or not, because it did not seem natural to me. To which he responded that I should not be afraid to use the voice recorder because "there's nothing natural here".

The situation that occurred at the square is more of an example of discipline that initially was not "added on from the outside", than it is an example of how individuals assume responsibility and become the agents of their own subjection. Yet, there were many occasions when this did occur, and to which I will turn shortly. However, I think it is important to note that while the discipline of the square was a subtle coercion, I was only made aware of this less visible form of discipline by a more visible form, that is, when the monitor told us to return to the square. I am unaware of whether new students were told that they needed to remain within the square between classes, I certainly was not, or if it was something that they just did by following the other students. In fact, I was not really informed of any of the prohibitions or norms of NJ, but rather just followed the others. It was only when a rule or norm had been broken that I was made aware of the subtle discipline that was taking place. It is interesting to think that even in a place like NJ where the aim is to change someone's behaviour there are not that many explicit rules or norms for regulating behaviour, and it is up to the individual to figure this out, or rather just follow what the others are doing. I think this also begs the question of how much of what we do in everyday life is 'natural' or spontaneous, and how much is actually a subtle coercion, and if one is only able to tell the difference by breaking the rules or norms.

The way in which students seem to spontaneously assemble at the square in-between classes is an example of the subtlety of discipline, yet it also begs the question of why students are expected to stay within the boundaries of the square. Of course, it ensures that the students at all times can be observed; albeit, not in the way envisioned by Bentham's panopticon whereby the inmate resides in the periphery and is observed from the centre, but rather this spatial arrangement is reversed, so that the inmates occupy the centre and the observer occupies the periphery. Yet, it still functions according the principle of panopticism which ensures that the inmate is visible at all times, while the observer remains largely invisible, due to the architecture of the square whereby one's gaze is directed towards the centre. One of the reasons for observation is of course to limit any dangerous or prohibited activities and interactions to occur, as most of the NJB students can be characterised as perhaps dangerous individuals. That is, individuals who have committed violent crimes or have been involved in gangsterism or have been to jail before. They are also individuals who are schemers and are able to get what they want from other people, which in a large part is due to their status as 'drug addicts'. Overall, the individuals could be

characterised as deviants who need to be observed in order to limit the possibility of any deviant behaviour. Yet, there was also another reason why students were expected to remain within the square and were expected to remain constantly visible throughout the programme.

While speaking with Peter about the discipleship programme, he told me this

> "You see what they should be doing is learning things in the class and using it here, while you are in this controlled environment. Where there's people watching you, people that can, if anything happens, 'whoa wow, that's far enough' kind of thing. While you're here, use what you learn in classes and try and implement it here, so that when you go out, you got that. But no the problem is, is that they learn it in the class, they sit there [the square], and they talk about things like, how they used to drug on the outside, you know, 'I used to rob the people and I stole this and I stole that' and all of these things".

We can see here that, while observing the students in-between classes did limit the possibility of violent or dangerous activities or interactions from occurring, another reason for observation was to provide a 'controlled environment' so that students could practice what they learnt in the classes. In all aspects of the programme, even during times of 'recreation', a subtle discipline was at play in order to get students to be a certain way. Furthermore, it was not only about being a certain way while one was at NJ, but practicing being a certain way, so that when one left NJ they could continue to be a certain way. There was an assumption that the discipline and habits that one formed and practiced at NJ would stay with the student when he/she left the programme. Furthermore, there was the assumption that new habits had to be acquired in a 'controlled environment'. Yet, there was also a question of authenticity – Peter was not even suspicious but certain that the students were not implementing what they learnt in class, but rather talking about how they used to be on the 'outside'. It is interesting that Peter was not so much concerned with what the students might do, but rather with what they were talking about. We find here a discourse about the way in which individuals acquire new habits, and a preoccupation with a particular habit; as well as an understanding that at all times in the programme students were expected to be acting a certain way, yet were also expected to not do so.

The discipleship programme and normalization

I would like to turn to an understanding that Peter had of the discipleship programme in order to discuss why it was necessary to acquire new habits in a controlled environment. According to Peter

> "The programme is more for, these guys don't know about, they didn't go to school, they didn't have jobs, nothing of getting up in the mornings, being somewhere, having responsibilities, being comfortable. That's what the programme does for them […] Get up early, do this do that, go to classes, go to work, then do this, then do that. Like a normal, well it's not a normal life, you know, but everyone's got things that they have to do, tasks that they have to complete, you know, things that they are responsible for".

Peter had a particular conception of 'the programme'. We might term this the 'formal' aspects of the programme; that is, the externally imposed discipline of the programme: the timetable, the punishments and rewards, etc. For Peter the aim of the formal aspects of the programme was to establish a sense of routine and responsibility in the lives of students; something which the students were thought to lack. While the lack of routine and responsibilities was understood to be something particular to NJ students, having a routine and responsibilities was thought to be something that everyone has – the norm. It is this 'normal life' – even though the supervisor is hesitant to call it that – that the discipline of the programme seeks to provide for the student. This 'normal life' can be thought of as functioning as 'the norm' does for Foucault.

For Foucault, discipline 'normalizes' (1975: 183; 2007: 85). Yet, what does Foucault mean by 'normalization'? In *Security, Territory and Population*, Foucault discusses 'disciplinary normalization' by contrasting it to the way in which 'security' normalizes. I do not wish to discuss the comparison he makes between 'security' and 'discipline', rather I want to highlight his discussion of 'disciplinary normalization' in this lecture. According to Foucault

> "Disciplinary normalization consists first of all in positing a model, an optimal model that is constructed in terms of a certain result, and the operation of disciplinary normalization consists in trying to get people, movements, and actions to conform to this model, the normal being precisely that which can conform to this norm, and the abnormal that which is incapable of conforming to the norm. In other words, it is

> not the normal and the abnormal that is fundamental and primary in disciplinary normalization, it is the norm. That is, there is an originally prescriptive character of the norm and the determination and the identification of the normal and the abnormal becomes possible in relation to this posited norm" (2007: 85).

We can see here that the lack of routine and responsibilities that students were thought to have before beginning the discipleship programme is 'abnormal', that is, it is not 'normal' because it does not subscribe to the 'norm', which is having a routine and responsibilities. Initially, this is how the student can come to be in a place like NJ in the first place, because there is a sense that lacking routine and responsibilities – discipline – is not normal, and hence something must be done to rectify that situation. Thus, everyone enters the programme as 'abnormal' - which itself points to a disciplinary mechanism that has already been at work in their lives – and it is during the programme that disciplinary normalization occurs whereby those who are able to conform to the norm are considered normal and those who cannot, become once again abnormal. I think that it is important to take into consideration that the shared belief amongst students that they were at NJ because they lacked discipline at home or wherever they were coming from, should be taken as an indication that disciplinary normalization was already at work in their lives, because to believe that one is in the situation that they find themselves in because of a lack of discipline is precisely how disciplinary normalization and panopticism functions. That is, there is already a norm (an ideal model) in the mind of the individual, and upon looking at their situation they find that it is not the same as this ideal model and hence must change. The individual feels solely responsible for their situation because that is how discipline is able to make individuals the subject of their own subjection, thus increasing the efficiency of normalization. I would now like to describe a few encounters I had during fieldwork in order to discuss how normalization worked at NJ.

Normalization and *skarreling*

During working projects I joined the students as they were de-weeding the garden just outside of the NJB section. It was common for students to not only smoke cigarettes at the square but almost anywhere where they would find themselves at the Ark. At the beginning of my fieldwork I used to bring my own cigarettes and smoke with them. While de-wedding the garden, a couple of students and I decided to take a short smoke break. One of the newly arrived students asked me if I had a cigarette for him, this was the first time that

anyone had asked me for a cigarette. Upon asking me this, another student reprimanded him and told him that he must "stop acting like that". I did not know what was going on, I did not know the rules of the programme. I asked the student who reprimanded him whether I was allowed to give students cigarettes. He responded that yes I was allowed to give students cigarettes but that they were not allowed to ask for cigarettes; I had to offer it. The student, that had asked me for a cigarette, then responded that how was I supposed to know that he wanted a cigarette if he does not ask? The other student did not reply with words, but just looked at him in a manner which suggested that he knew that he was right and what he had done was wrong. The other student accepted this but then added that the cigarette was not just for him but for everyone, that he would share it. I ended up giving a cigarette to the student, by offering one to him, which he shared with another student.

While the student was reprimanded for what he asked for, the scolding was more directed towards the way in which he asked for it, and what that represents. He stood very close to me and spoke in a hushed voice, he cocked his head back and squinted his eyes a little. It was a combination of a beggar and a gangster; that he really needs something and wants you to feel sorry for him, but also that he might just take it anyway, so a bit of fear. The manner in which he asked me for a cigarette can be thought of as a technique of the body associated with '*skarreling*' or hustling. To *skarrel* is "to scrabble, rummage, and in local use, to hustle. It has strong negative valences" (Ross, 2015: 104). It has a term and a behaviour which has negative connotations and is largely associated with a delinquent male, in particular it is largely associated with an unemployed coloured male or a homeless person. While there were no explicit rules against *skarreling* at NJ, it was a form of behaviour that was associated with their lives outside of the Ark. It is interesting that while there is no accepted definition of what *skarreling* is, almost everyone knows when it is occurring. It is also interesting that such *skarreling* occurred during working projects, as it provides the opposite of what *skarreling* is, which is honest hard work, whereas *skarreling* is thought to be a form of dishonest work.

During my tour of the Ark on my first visit, my attention was directed towards the security guards by the staff member and I was told that many of the security guards come from NJ. Later in my fieldwork I found out that all of the security guards come from NJB and belong to a particular section called 'security'. The security section is like the NJB section in that it has dorms and a place of recreation (like the square) called the 'coffee bar'. It is situated

adjacent to the visitor's parking at the front of the Ark, which is a fair distance away from the NJ section which is situated at the back of the Ark. This is important because individuals in the security section may still be in the process of completing their discipleship programme, and hence are still required to attend classes. Those in the security section are responsible, as the name suggests, for the security of the Ark. They wear a particular uniform: black pants, a white button up shirt and a black tie. When entering the Ark a visitor must first sign in with a security guard, where one provides their name and their particular reason for visiting the Ark. The security guards can also be found patrolling the circumference of the Ark throughout the day. The security guards work in teams, and each team is assigned a shift. There are three shifts and each shift is eight hours in duration.

On one occasion I was hanging out with some of the students at the coffee bar. The coffee bar consists of a small room, with a large wooden bar table and sofas situated against the walls. I was sitting on one of the sofas conversing with a student I had conversed with many times before, I call Daniel. At that moment another student who I was familiar with and call Joseph walked in. He asked me what car was mine, and I told him that it was the black golf. He said that it looks dirty and that he can wash it for me. At that moment I felt a bit uneasy, I thought to myself "why does he want to wash my car?" Joseph laughs, and says that he is trying to get something from me. I told Daniel that he can wash my car if he wants but I am not asking him to do it. He sort of half-heartedly tells me that he can do it for R10. Later on in the day (after the second class of the day) I am sitting with Joseph again, this time we are sitting on a bench by the square. I see Daniel standing opposite us, on the other side of the square. It looks like he is trying to communicate something to Joseph but I cannot make out what it is. Joseph starts laughing again and tells me that Daniel wants him to ask me for a cigarette. He tells me that this is what it is like on the outside, but he wants to change so he will not act like that. Daniel comes towards us and sits between me and Joseph. He starts sighing, saying that he would really like a cigarette, hinting in my direction. I tell him I don't smoke anymore. He asks if I don't have any cigarettes lying around. Again, he does so half-heartedly. He tells me that he has a mobile car wash on the outside, and that he does not want to receive blessings all the time but work for what he gets.

I think there is much to discuss in this example. The norm at NJ is to not ask for anything, but rather to receive gifts or 'blessings'. We find this in the previous example whereby the student was reprimanded for asking for a cigarette. Yet, this does not mean that cigarettes

are not shared amongst students. It was commonplace, even expected, to share a single cigarette among multiple students. I think that the expectation to share bypassed the necessity of having to ask for a cigarette. The sensibility that one should not ask for anything, is based on the idea that one will receive everything they need from God; as the supervisor tells the students in disciple class "God will give you all your basic needs" and then in elementary class the supervisor tells the students "we deny the power or God by turning to people". Interestingly, it is not just that God will provide for the individual, but that the individual denies the power of God by depending on other people; thus, not depending on other people almost becomes like an act of faith in the power of God to provide, and hence depending on others is interpreted as not having faith. This idea perhaps is not so unique to NJ, but what is unique is the way in which the Christian belief in the power of God to provide for oneself is combined with the idea that to *skarrel* is dishonest work. To *skarrel* then becomes a way of denying one's faith in God, as Peter made explicit when he asked the students the hypothetical question "if you are a child of the King of Kings that makes you royalty and does royalty skarrel?"

It is important to note that in both examples the student who was engaging in problematic behaviour was not judged to be so by an authority figure but by a fellow student. In the first example the student was not reprimanded by an authority figure but by another student. In the second example, the behaviour of the student who was trying to get something from me was perceived as problematic by another student. This is an example of how disciplinary normalization works, whereby anyone within the system may act as a potential agent for discipline, thus increasing its efficiency. It also ensures that any non-conforming behaviour may become a potential reason for punishment (Foucault, 1975: 179). While the students were not punished, there was still an effort to normalize their behaviour. In the first example there was an attempt to correct the behaviour of the student by reprimanding the student, there was an attempt to directly affect the behaviour of another student by making that student aware of the problematic behaviour he was performing. However, in the second example the student did not try to directly affect the behaviour of another student, but instead interpreted the behaviour of another as something to distance himself from; he did not attempt to correct the behaviour of another but rather interpreted the behaviour of another as a way of correcting his own behaviour. In fact, it was common for students to tell me that one should learn from the mistakes of others, which I think was partly directed

explicitly at me in that I should learn from the mistakes that they had made, but it was also partly concerned with the way in which students should constantly be learning from each other on how to behave appropriately.

Conclusion: Normalizing the behaviour of students

We can see here that the 'controlled environment' which the supervisor mentioned, does not only refer to the presence of authority figures and a routine, but also the normalizing gaze of both fellow students and oneself. The 'controlled environment' is one where an artificial environment is created in order to limit the possibility of outside influences, the outside influences here being those times when a student behaves or thinks in a way they would have before entering the programme. In the examples above it relates directly to those times when a student behaves in a way that could be interpreted as *skarreling*. This is because on the one hand *skarreling* is a behaviour associated with one's life outside or before the programme, hence it represents a lifestyle that the individual is trying to distance himself from. In a way, it represents a sort of contagion, which if allowed in the controlled environment of NJ might spread and hamper the progress of all students. On the other hand, *skarreling* is not a behaviour that a born-again Christian engages in, and students are expected to practice being a born-again Christian at NJ, thus to *skarrel* is to not practice being a Christian. There is a negative and positive here: behaviours that can be interpreted as *skarreling* must be prevented, which is the negative aspect, as it entails getting rid of something; yet, there is also a positive aspect, as new habits must be formed to take the place of those associated with *skarreling*.

While *skarreling* can be contrasted with honest hard work, there is more to the behaviour of *skarreling* than just the economic aspect. To *skarrel* entailed a relation with other people that was not ideal for the born-again Christian at NJ – it entailed a relation of dependence. It was interpreted as a way of turning away from God, by turning to people. To be too dependent on other people was no small matter at NJ, and in fact was a major concern in the discourse of Christian restoration. In fact, to be too dependent on other people was an important characteristic of the categories that were used at NJ when speaking about the students, as will be discussed in later chapters. It was not that *skarreling* was not a viable livelihood choice for many of the students and it was never really spoken about as an unsustainable way to make a living. Rather, it was what *skarreling* represented to the

students and staff members that was problematic, as it did not fit into the 'normal' life of which Peter was speaking about. The problematic status of behaviours that could be interpreted as *skarreling* was due to an idea of what the 'normal' life was, more so than any economic considerations; even the comparison with hard honest work was not a comparison based on economic grounds, but more so with what was considered 'normal'.

Chapter 3: Projects and duties

In this chapter I discuss another aspect of the discipleship programme that featured heavily in the lives of students: 'projects' and 'duties'. The NJB students were required to perform particular projects, while NJG students were required to perform particular duties. Both projects and duties entailed the undertaking of different forms of manual labour. For example, during fieldwork I observed the NJB students perform different tasks that can be thought of as manual labour: de-weeding the garden, cutting reeds, moving patches of grass and burning old papers and cardboard. Basically, the manual labour that NJB students were expected to perform daily at specified times were tasks that were associated with maintaining the upkeep of not only NJ, but the entire Ark premises. I was unable to observe the NJG students perform their duties, as these tasks were confined to the NJG section, a place where I did not feel as welcome as the NJB section. Thus, data that I acquired concerned with their duties is based on conversations I had with NJG students rather than observations. I was told by NJG students that their duties consisted largely of keeping the NJG section clean and orderly, that is they were largely occupied with what can be thought of as 'domestic' work. Thus, there was a strict division of labour between the NJB and the NJG students, whereby the NJB students were largely involved with tasks all over the Ark, and NJG students were confined to their own section. It was this gendered division of labour that was particularly salient during fieldwork.

NJG duties: A claustrophobic feeling

If one walks around the Ark during the week between the times of 12:00 and 15:00 you will see students from NJB involved in numerous tasks. This is not the case with the NJG students. Their duties involved what can be called 'domestic' work, such as cleaning and sometimes working in the garden by their section and these duties were confined to the NJG section. While conducting a focus group with five students from NJG they all voiced their discontentment about what they referred to as their duties. One student told me that she feels "claustrophobic" in NJG, that they are "trapped in the four walls". Another resident told me that she would be fine with the work if the stuff was actually dirty, but most of the time it is clean. All of them agreed that their duties are boring, and it feels like they are just doing the same thing over and over again. A student tells me that it is like they

are training them to be housewives and she does not want to be a housewife. Furthermore, all five of the NJG students expressed their distaste with the fact that the NJB students get to do different things and are allowed to walk around outside. In particular, they were upset that they could not visit the animals[5].

As we are talking one of the students gets up and tells the other students that she can see the animals from here. After she says this they tentatively begin to look out the window. I get up and also start looking out the window. I can see the geese and the goats. The other women seem a bit reluctant to look, but then the student says "look, you can see pigs." I am looking but I cannot see the pigs, their pen is blocked from view. I say "you can't see the pigs." She sort of laughs, but in a way that she thinks she shouldn't be laughing, and says softly, sort of under her breath "no, I mean you can see the boys." We all laugh at this. This example is quite illustrative of exactly what they were telling me, that even now they were confined in four walls – as we were sitting in Pastor Janet's lounge – while NJB residents were just outside doing their projects. When I asked Michelle during an interview, who was a supervisor, if there are any differences between the NJB and NJG students she responded

> "*Ja* [yes], not really. For instance, with the working projects, the girls get more lighter projects than the guys, because the guys do very heavy stuff, like carrying blocks and grass and stuff like that. The girls can't do that, no. So, they attend to, make sure everything is nice and clean, and stuff like that".

It is quite clear here that the NJG supervisor understands the gendered division of labour as merely a practical exercise, that is, the tasks that NJB students do are because they, being male, are better able to do such tasks. Meanwhile, it is not that woman are somehow better equipped to perform the tasks assigned to them, but rather that they are unable to undertake the 'heavy stuff' that the NJB students do. Even if we are to take this belief or lack of belief in the physical abilities of the female students at face value and then compare it with the particular tasks that the male students were performing it is an absurd statement to make. This is because almost all of the tasks that I observed the NJB students perform as projects did not require one to be exceptionally strong – how strong does one need to be to de-weed a garden or burn cardboard? Except for one activity which required the NJB

[5] The Ark is not only home to people but animals as well. In fact, the same way in which there were different sections for different categories of people, there was also a separate section for animals, which itself was divided into different sections for different types of animals. The different animals I saw: ducks, goats, rabbits, pigs, a bull and too many cats to count.

students to cut and carry large patches of grass on their backs from a particular location outside of the Ark's premises into the Ark's premises – an activity the students call "wearing grass". In fact, many of the NJB students were unable to complete their journey with the grass patches on their backs because they were too heavy, and one student even fall flat on his face from the weight pushing down on him and he was by all means not a small fellow. It is obvious that the reason for the gendered division of labour is not because of the any inherent biological differences between men and women, but rather is based on ideological reasons. The reason that there is a gendered division of labour is the same reason why there is gender segregation in the rest of the programme; that is to keep the male and female students segregated. What is interesting is that in the performance of projects, that the male students are required to work outside, being responsible for the maintenance of the Ark, while the female students are required to stay indoors and are responsible for making sure "everything is nice and clean". This is surely based on an ideology which segregates work according to gender, and each gender is assigned a different position.

NJB Projects: A feeling of camaraderie and confidence

It might be useful to compare the NJG students' experiences of duties to that of the NJB students. One of my first experiences of fieldwork was joining the NJB students as they undertook their projects. Overall it was an enjoyable experience and I was glad to have been able to participate with the students. On that particular day a group of students were assigned the project of cutting and collecting reeds for the bull, i.e. "pastor bully". After classes groups of NJB students are assigned different projects. I was not present to the allocation of different projects on this occasion, but rather met the students in the square, where they were preparing to head off to their designated area of work. As this was the first time that I was meeting this group of students, they were eager to find out why I was there. They asked me many questions: where I stay, how long have I been staying there, what am I studying, how long have I been studying for, what will I do after my studies, etc. They constantly asked me questions throughout the day, perhaps even more questions than I asked them. The constant barrage of questions did not go unnoticed by one of the students and he told me that I should be careful how I answer them as they are going to use it against me somehow, after which he then asked me what my identification number is. This statement and the subsequent question were not meant in a foreboding and menacing way, but rather in a more playful way, as banter.

There was much banter between myself and the students. Upon meeting the students at the square, they began to get the tools and equipment needed for the task at hand. First, everyone had to be wearing gumboots. Upon seeing that I was not wearing boots, but sneakers, one of the students told me that I should get boots. He asked me to take of my shoes and that he would acquire the boots for me. After saying this, the same student that asked me for my ID number, told me that I should watch out because he is going to steal my shoes. Second, everyone had to acquire the appropriate tools, which entailed a collection of machetes, clippers and small hand saws. One of the students hands me a saw. As we are making our way to the designated area, another student tells me that the saw is an inappropriate tool and hands me a machete. I think that he gave me the saw in jest. The way in which the particular student told me that the other student was going to steal my shoes, is an example of the way in which the students themselves interpreted my presence and themselves. Perhaps it was a way of coming to grips with the absurdity of the situation. In a way I felt that they must have thought that I thought of them as dangerous individuals, who are always looking to hustle someone, or that they have some sort of scheme in mind. The particular way in which this was expressed, by making jokes about it, was a particular way in which a particular student expressed this sense. Other students expressed this sense in different ways.

There was another student who expressed himself in a different way. He seemed to be much more melancholic and looking to make amends for what he had done. During working projects on that day he told me about himself and the other students. He told me that he used to be a chef, but was caught stealing from work, and then fired. He ended up robbing people on the trains. He also referred to the other students by telling me that a lot of them were involved in heists and violent crimes. At times he seemed to be quite annoyed with the behaviour of the other students, especially when they were engaged in behaviours that he considered childish. For instance, while we were walking along a river, moving from one location to another, some of the students started kicking sand into the river. He scolded them and told them that they should stop acting like kids, they all have kids. He even showed considerable concern with my studies, as whenever I would see him he would ask me how my thesis was going, and was quite sure that by being there I would produce an excellent piece of research. On one accession he even told me that I will write a “master piece”, which I think was a play on master’s thesis. The point that I am trying to make is,

that if an important aspect of the discipleship programme is about allowing the student time to reflect on who they are, and to try and change who they are, then that will be expressed in different ways. Whereas the previous student was more jovial, and made a lot of jokes about the situation, this student was more serious and expressed himself in a sterner fashion, yet this does not mean that both of them were not deeply concerned with their own as well as the current situation. Rather, I think that both examples refer to a way of expressing a particular way of thinking and feeling about themselves and others, as part of a process of reorienting themselves to themselves and others.

I would like to return to the project. On this day the project that was to be completed entailed cutting and collecting reeds for pastor bully. After putting on our boots and collecting our tools we made our way through a gate in the back fence into the area directly behind the Ark. The environment is unpleasant. It is sandy and full of rubbish. There are kraals a short distance away, where goats and pigs are kept. It smells like refuse. We make our way to a body of water, where reeds are growing. The students begin their work. A couple of students cut the reeds and pass them to a group of other students who place the reeds into piles. These piles are then taken back into the Ark and placed in pastor bully's pen. At first, I observe but then also begin cutting down reeds. There is a feeling of camaraderie in the air, as everyone is working together to achieve a common goal. There is also a sense of enjoyment as everyone is talking and laughing, and overall it does not seem something to be taken too seriously. There is also a feeling of exercise as there are physical movements to perform. There is also a monitor present. The monitor serves a similar purpose to that of the square, which is to observe the students, so as to ensure that students stick to the norms of the programme, but in the case of projects, to also ensure that they work.

The undisciplined manipulation of bodies during projects

If we compare the coordinated movement of bodies of students during projects with the movement and positioning of bodies during classes, then there is a difference. In order to illustrate this I would like to describe the way in which students are required to move between sections during classes. As I mentioned earlier, students who are in the security section may still be in the process of completing their discipleship programme and hence are still required to attend classes. The students line up in single file at the edge of the

parking lot. Once all the students are in position, an authority figure (either a monitor or a supervisor), leads them to the NJ section. The students walk in single file, with their heads bowed and their hands behind their backs to the NJ section. The authority figure walks in front of them and is not required to posture their body the same as the students. The students walk from the parking lot to the NJ section. This is how students move from one section to another when they have to attend classes. This is not how students move between sections during projects.

During projects students are not require to stand and move in single file, with their heads cast downward and their hands behind their backs. There does not seem to be any required posture, the only requirement being that they stay together and move in the same direction. This sort of subtle coercion is similar to the way in which discipline functions at the square, whereby students are just expected to stay within the confines of the square, but are not given any direct instructions as to what to do. Projects can be thought of as a combination of the discipline of the square and the classroom. This is because while students are instructed what to do and observed so as to ensure that they do what they are instructed to do, there is also room for negotiation on the students' part as to exactly what he does. Discipline here does not function as a way to create an 'efficient machine', but more so just as a way to take up time, that is to keep the student busy. This is evident by the way in which projects were undertaken, in that, the student was largely left to their own discretion as to how they would undertake the particular task, while the function of the monitor was merely just a presence so as to ensure that the student was doing something. The monitor also served as a source of advice as to how a particular task might be completed, but not as the final authority which would determine exactly how it was done, as there were times when students and monitors would negotiate as to the best way.

NJB projects: The principle of non-idleness

During projects one day I joined the students as they were de-weeding the garden. I asked them why it is that NJ makes them do these projects, and one of the students responded that it keeps them busy, otherwise they would just think of bad things like doing drugs. He also told me that it builds confidence and endurance. So far in this thesis I have paid particular attention to 'disciplinary space', yet in discussing discipline it is also important to take into consideration 'disciplinary time'. Foucault deals with disciplinary time in *Discipline and Punish* in a section entitled 'the control of activity'. It is here that we find his discussion

of the timetable, in particular as a technique which makes use of three methods: "establish rhythms, impose particular occupations, regulate the cycles of repetition" (1975: 149). There is another general feature of the timetable, and disciplinary time in general, which Foucault names 'exhaustive use':

> "The principle that underlay the time-table in its traditional form was essentially negative; it was the principle of non-idleness: it was forbidden to waste time, which was counted by God and paid for by men; the time-table was to eliminate the danger of wasting it – a moral offence and economic dishonesty. Discipline, on the other hand, arranges a positive economy; it poses the principle of a theoretically evergrowing use of time: exhaustion rather than use; it is a question of extracting, from time, ever more available moments and, from each moment, ever more useful forces" (1975: 154).

When Foucault writes of the timetable in its 'traditional' form he is referring to two important ideas that inform his understanding of discipline. Firstly, by referring to the traditional form of the timetable he is referring to his understanding that the particular techniques that we associate with discipline today were not invented in the 18th century, it is not that there were no timetables before the 18th century or that there were no panoptic spatial arrangements, etc. Rather, and this is the second important idea, it is that during the 18th century the particular techniques associated with discipline began to change in ways which corresponded with a general disciplinary power that was becoming ever more present in societies in general. Importantly, while discipline is concerned with ordering a multiplicity, this is not something unique to disciplinary power, but perhaps can be thought of as the general aim of discipline throughout history. Rather, what does mark disciplinary power as distinct from the discipline that came before it is its concern with how that aim will be achieved, which is through increasing the docility and utility "of all the elements of the system" (1975: 218). Disciplinary power is characterised by a concern with making discipline more efficient.

The point of this lengthy discussion of what Foucault means by referring to the traditional form, is to lead into a discussion of the comparison he makes between the traditional form and discipline, in order to better understand how discipline is functioning during the projects that students are required to perform. We find in the excerpt above that for

Foucault the timetable in is traditional form is essentially negative, in that its essential aim is 'non-idleness'. On the other hand, the timetable as a technique of discipline is essentially positive, in that its aim can essentially be thought of as 'initiative'. One timetable is concerned with using time, while the other is concerned with exhausting time. If we then think of the projects that the students are required to perform, and the students' understanding of them as something to keep them busy, then it becomes apparent that the underlying principle of projects is one of non-idleness and not initiative or 'exhaustive use'. The projects and duties that the students are required to perform are not directed towards making them better at performing those tasks – it does not result in a student mastering that particular task. Rather, the projects and duties that students are required to perform are directed towards some other end besides the actual task that is being performed.

It is interesting that students believe that the manual labour that they have to perform prevents them from thinking about 'bad things', as this entails a relation between the mind and the body. By performing physical tasks the mind is kept busy. There is an understanding here of the mind-body relation, and this understanding seems to posit a direct correlation; whereas, if the body is busy then the mind is busy. Furthermore, there is also a philosophy of mind here, in that, rather than trying to control one's thoughts by being idle and stilling the mind, there is a pursuit to indirectly control one's thoughts by not being idle, hence, not allowing oneself to be aware of thoughts. This can be contrasted to the work that is done in the classroom and during devotion, where there is a directed mental effort, and either communication with God or acquiring knowledge. The manual labour that students are required to perform can be thought of as a way of keeping the mind of the student busy, at a time when they are not occupied with directing their awareness towards God, because it is during those times that the student is at risk of having 'bad thoughts'. Thus, we find a similar situation at the Ark to that of the monastic rules set out by Saint Benedict in The Rule, which is that "Idleness is an enemy of the soul: Therefore, the brothers should be occupied according to a schedule in either manual labour or holy reading" (Saint Benedict cited in Asad, 1993: 148).

In Asad's discussion of manual labour in Medieval monasteries he pays particular attention to how manual labour functioned within a disciplinary system in order to bring about particular Christian dispositions. He argues that manual labour, especially for the Cistercians, served to bring about the virtue of humility (Asad, 1993: 151). According to Asad

(1993: 151), “For Cistercians, it was precisely humiliation that constituted the point of manual labour, not its economic instrumentality”. Asad makes a clear association between manual labour and the virtue of humility. Yet, this does not seem to be the case with the projects that NJB students had to perform. There was no sense that the work that the students were doing was humiliating, or that in performing the tasks they were cultivating a sense of humility. On the contrary, the NJB students were quite proud of the work that they were performing, and as I mentioned before, there was always a sense of enjoyment and camaraderie in the work that was being done. Furthermore, we should take notice of what the student said, that while the projects are meant to keep the students busy, he also mentioned that it builds confidence and endurance. Thus, I do not think that the manual labour that NJB students had to perform should be thought of as humiliating work, directed towards instilling in the student a sense of humility; but rather, as physical work, which was directed towards empowering the individual by making the individual feel physically well. Yet, this was only the case with the NJB students, as the NJG students did not feel a sense of empowerment with the work that they were expected to perform.

Conclusion: Work as non-idleness

As we find in the focus group discussion with the NJG students, they also thought of the work that they had to perform as something to keep them busy, the same as the NJB students. Yet, unlike the NJB students, this work did not make them feel better about themselves but trapped in their environment. I think this sense of claustrophobia is related to the experience of NJG students in a number of ways. In general, we can think of this feeling of claustrophobia as being trapped in an expected gender role. In this way, the feeling of being “trapped in these four walls” does not only refer to the way in which the NJG students are physically confined to a particular area, but it also related to the type of work that they were expected to perform, i.e. domestic work. This is even more apparent by the way in which the NJG students would refer to their work as ‘duties’ rather than projects; which implies more of a sense of a moral obligation, than an individual or collective enterprise which seeks to accomplish something. Even though, as we know, the projects that the NJB students engaged in where not primarily pursued for the accomplishment of a particular task, yet there was still a feeling of accomplishment. Yet, with the NJG students there does not seem to be much of a feeling of accomplishment with the tasks that they were expected to perform. However, I still do not think that the tasks that the NJG students

had to perform should be thought of as a way to bring about humility. It is better to think of it, as the students did themselves, as a duty to be performed, a moral obligation. The point of which is to cultivate an attitude of obedience, as everything else in the discipleship programme is geared towards, for both NJB and NJG students.

We find that that there is a gendered division of labour at NJ. On one hand the division of labour can be thought of as a disciplinary process in order to increase the efficiency of the discipleship programme. Although, not in a way where those who are most suited for a particular task are assigned that particular task, but rather the division of labour increases the efficiency of the programme, by limiting what the Ark considers to be dangerous communications. The division of labour is also based on an ideology which associates physical 'hard' work with the male gender, and domestic 'light' work with the female gender. Each student is expected to perform a particular gender role. Furthermore, this work is performed not for the sake of mastering tasks but for the sake of not being idle, as idleness may lead one to have 'bad' thoughts. For the NJB students this manual labour is not performed for the sake of cultivating a sense of humility, but for the sake of cultivating a sense of confidence in oneself and one's abilities. For the NJG students, the manual labour that they are required to perform is directed more towards the performance of a moral obligation, which does not result in a feeling of confidence, but rather a feeling of claustrophobia, of being trapped in one's expected gender role.

Chapter 4: The addict

In the first three chapters I focused on the discipline of the discipleship programme. Yet, there seemed to be something more at work at NJ in the lives of the students. There were very particular ideas about who the students were, among the staff as well as themselves. Furthermore, there was an ideology about their affliction, and how to heal that affliction. Restoration was concerned with more than just providing the students with a routine and responsibilities, it was about restoring the individual to the person who they were before they became an addict or a 'broken person'. Part of the restoration process was concerned with routine and responsibilities – discipline – but another part of the programme was concerned with how the students thought and spoke about themselves. In large part this concern was expressed by the use of particular categories: 'addict', 'broken person' and 'born-again'. In this chapter I will focus on the category of the addict: how the addict was constructed by the students and staff members.

According to Saba Mahmood (2005: 16) "the terms people use to organize their lives are not simply gloss for universally shared assumptions about the world and one's place in it, but are actually constitutive of different forms of personhood, knowledge and experience". The category of the addict at NJ was constitutive of particular forms of personhood, knowledge and experience. Yet, I think it is also important to mention the way in which the students' lives were also constitutive of the category of the addict. Garriott and Raikhel mention how as addiction takes on the status of a 'global form' "it both shapes and is shaped by the contexts in which it takes hold and through which it passes" (2013: 1). In some ways the students thought of themselves and were spoken about as stereotypical addicts in a sort of common sense way, and the category of the addict constituted a form of personhood, which all students were thought to embody. However, there was a sense that the lives of the students' constituted the category of the addict as well. There was a particular knowledge of the students as persons embedded in particular social relations which constituted a very particular type of addict.

Addiction as a lifestyle: The person/environment dyad

In order to acquire an understanding of who an addict was at NJ, it will be helpful to begin with how the addict was conceived by a senior authority figure of the Ark – a pastor. While

discussing NJ during an interview with a pastor I call Pastor Hannah I asked her who she considers to be an addict, her response

> "Well, I consider a drug addict to be a person that loses all sense of direction, responsibilities, compassion towards anything in life because of the drugs; because of that need to have that drug […] And when you're an addict you don't care, that's what I consider a drug addict. It's when you don't care that what you are doing to yourself is actually killing you […] the only thing you care about is drugs".

It is important to take note of the term 'drug addict', as this was the most common term used to refer to an addict. The figure of the addict was always associated with the figure of the drug addict at the Ark. Yet, the most important aspect of this response is the idea that all a drug addict cares about is drugs. There is a sensibility here that drug addiction is something that takes over one's entire life, it in a sense becomes one's life, and there is no room for other responsibilities or even any other purpose. In a way to be an addict was associated with a particular type of 'lifestyle'. The idea of being an addict as a lifestyle was something that was mentioned in outreach class as well, as the teacher told the students that "manifesting newness of life is something that should happen" while discussing what it is to be a born-again Christian. She then went on to say that "prostitution has a lifestyle and walking with Jesus has a lifestyle". Thus, it is because addiction (and other activities that NJ would consider as problematic behaviours) was associated with a lifestyle, as something that takes over one's entire life, that in order for restoration to occur one needs to change their whole life, and not just a part of it. The routine and discipline of the programme can be thought of as a way of getting the student accustomed to a particular type of lifestyle that was supposedly different from the lifestyle they were used to. This is also why behaviours that could be interpreted as belonging to one's lifestyle before coming to the Ark were thought of as problematic or prohibited, as was the case with those behaviours that were interpreted as *skarreling*.

However, to change one's whole life is not always possible. This sentiment was expressed by Peter, who likened the student's situation to an equation; whereby the student him/herself is on one side of a plus sign and the environment the student is coming from is on the other side of the plus sign. He then went on to say

> "The environment, he can't change that, he's got no say over, you know, where he comes from, and that is one part of the equation. He is the other part. So, he has to change, so that something, so that he can get a different answer, you know, a different outcome in the end".

Thus, the student's situation was thought of as consisting of two parts: the environment from which the student was coming from and the student him/herself. The two interrelated parts of the person and their environment were parts of one's whole life, and according to the supervisor one has no control over their environment but one does have control over oneself. Thus, while addiction was thought to be something that takes over one's whole life, and as a result one's whole life needs to change, the lack of agency that one might have over their environment means that they need to change themselves, in order to affect some change in their life. It is important to note here, not only the emphasis on the individual that informs much thinking at the Ark, but also the responsibility that the individual student has with regards to changing themselves. Up to this point much of this thesis has been focused on how the programme seeks to change the student, but another important aspect of the programme is the emphasis that is placed on the effort and ability of the student to change themselves. In a way, while the student may not be able to change the environment from which they are coming and to which they may return, being at NJ did constitute a change of environment. It was a change of environment that was primarily aimed towards allowing the individual the opportunity to change themselves. The student cannot take the environment of the Ark with them when they leave, but they can use the environment of the Ark to change themselves so that they are a different person when they leave. Ultimately, there was a sensibility that one can overcome their circumstances by becoming a particular type of person, as well as the sensibility that one was unable to deal with their circumstances because they had become a particular type of person.

The inability to perform one's responsibilities: A bad attitude

The type of person that the student had become was an addict. While there was the sensibility that addiction takes over one's life, it might be useful to investigate exactly what aspects of one's life was taken over by addiction. There was a sensibility that addiction takes over one's life in a particular way, so that particular aspects of one's life are affected. This sensibility came through in the interview I had with Pastor Hannah, especially when she

spoke about her husband. After providing me with a description of who she thinks a drug addict is, she spoke about her husband

> "I wouldn't call my husband a drug addict, even though I say he was a drug addict, I don't consider him a drug addict. He worked, accepted his responsibilities, he was very good at his job, he didn't do it at work. He was always a great father, husband and son. He didn't let his family go without to support his drug habit. He didn't steal. But, he was on drugs. He was on drugs. Because the marijuana is a drug".

Earlier on in the interview she refers to her husband as a drug addict because he smoked marijuana. However, even though he was on drugs he still worked and had a good heart[6]. Throughout the quoted excerpt above we find the uncertainty that she feels as to whether her husband is or was a drug addict. He was a drug addict because he smoked marijuana but he was also not a drug addict because he still worked, looked after his family and never stole. While to say that a drug addict is someone who does not care about anything else besides using drugs is quite a general statement and does not point to anything specific, the fact that she mentions family, work and stealing is quite specific, and gives a sense of what she means by not caring about anything else. These cares were framed as responsibilities and a drug addict was someone who did not accept their responsibilities: their responsibility to work, their responsibility towards their family and their responsibility to not steal or break the law. Besides the sensibility that an addict was unable to perform their responsibilities, there was another sensibility, alluded to here by the Pastor's reference to the heart of her husband, which constructed the addict as someone with a bad attitude.

During an interview I had with Peter he spoke about the NJ students, and particularly he was referring to the NJB students, as individuals who even though they are coming from impoverished backgrounds take advantage of their parents in order to get what they want. While speaking to the supervisor about the students' lives outside of the Ark, he was adamant that most of the students still live at home with their parents. This was considered by the supervisor as not normal, as a way of living which was not congruent with the normal progression of life

[6] By saying that he had a "good heart" she may have been referring to his attitude, as the heart is sometimes associated with one's attitude in Christian discourse. This is based on a pamphlet I found at the Ark which discusses James 4:8, "Come near to God and he will come near to you. Wash your hands, you sinners and purify your hearts, you double-minded". The discussion of this verse then states "James' reference to their hands and hearts denoted that their sin involved both their actions and their attitudes.

> "A lot of these guys. It's not like, you normally, you know, you go to school, you finish school, you go to college, come out of college, move out, get yourself a job, move out, off you go. These guys will live till their forties with their parents".

There's the normal progression of school, college, moving out and then getting a job. This is similar to what the supervisor said about the normal person as having responsibilities – "things to do". However, here we find what is normal in terms of the normal progression of one's life. To have responsibilities can be thought of as the norm throughout one's life, and the progression from school to college to moving out to finding a job can be thought of as the 'normal' progression of life. Yet, the student has not followed the norm and is living in a situation which is considered 'abnormal'. That is, he may be in his thirties but he is still living at home with his parents. Furthermore, living at home is not considered a pleasant experience by the supervisor as he later adds

> "And they all live in mommy's house. Mommy's house is not like a three bedroom, no it's a two bedroom council flat, or something like that. All these people are propped in, because remember he's got his brothers and sisters who are doing the exact same thing. The house is bursting at the seams".

Even though the student was thought to be someone who was living with their parents at a phase of their life when they should not, the domestic environment was not one which was conducive for having them live there. For the supervisor this was largely a result of the attitude of the student who relied on his parents for his livelihood – especially his mother – rather than actively trying to move out of the house. That is, even though "the house is bursting at the seams" the student would rather stay at home and rely on his parents than try to move on with his life, and it is this attitude, as the supervisor calls it, that was characteristic of an addict, and why the student found himself in the situation he did. It is an attitude of depending on other people rather than taking responsibility for one's life. It is also characterized by a "lack of boundaries" as students would tell me, which was why they believed that they needed discipline in their lives. In fact, not being dependent on other people was a lesson that came up quite frequently in the classes, as in elementary class when the supervisor told the students that "we deny the power of God by turning to other people", and in disciple class when the supervisor told the students that "you mustn't be in *skuld* [debt]". Thus, the addict at NJ, especially those of NJB, were thought to be individuals who would rather stay in an unpleasant situation, which may have been too comfortable for

them, than take responsibility for their lives. In a way the addict was thought to be not only dependent on drugs but too dependent on other people as well.

NJ is not a rehab: The differences between rehabilitation and restoration

In speaking about addiction with the students, they would constantly remind me that NJ is not a rehab but a restoration centre. Like the figure of the addict, there was also the image of the 'rehab', which like the addict, the students would contrast their situation with. In fact, the image of the addict and the rehab, were employed by the students as mutually reinforcing images, in that, the rehab was spoken of as a particular type of place, for a particular type of person. As most of the students told me that they had been to rehabs before, they spoke about the rehab as a place that was not for them, that did not help them because of the type of person that they are. Perhaps, we can think of the rehab as a place and treatment for a particular type of addict, and NJ as a place and treatment for a particular type of addict, at least, that is how they were spoken of by the students. It was interesting to find that in speaking about themselves as addicts, students would contrast this with how addiction is treated in a rehab, whereas the staff were more direct in telling me exactly who an addict is. Yet, most of the time the conceptions of the students and the staff were largely congruent with each other. I would now like to discuss the comparisons that students made between the rehab and NJ, in order to give a picture of how the students understood themselves as a particular type of addict.

While conducting fieldwork I would often begin my interaction with a prospective participant by telling him/her that I am conducting research on addiction and addiction treatment in the Western Cape. More often than not the student would respond by telling me that NJ is not a rehab, and then elaborate on the difference between a rehab and NJ which is a restoration centre. While de-weeding the garden one afternoon during working projects I asked a student what the difference is between NJ and other rehabs he had been to. He told me that the difference is "at a rehab you speak with social workers, doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists but at New Jerusalem there is none of that". The other students agreed with him. There was a clear association here of rehabs with particular specialists or perhaps a team of specialists, as well as a type of treatment or therapy. The specialists: doctors and psychiatrists (bio), psychologists (psycho) and social workers (social).

The treatment is talking. I will refer to this as the biopsychosocial model of rehabilitation. The biopsychosocial model refers to a collection of specialists with whom the individual, or in the context of a rehab, the patient talks to, as the student put it. Thus, there was the association of rehabs with particular specialists, as well as with a particular type of relation or treatment, in this case it is a relation of talking: the patient talks to a specialist and has the choice of a number of different types of specialists to talk to. This was contrasted with NJ where "there is none of that", in terms of a team of biopsychosocial specialists with whom one can talk with.

Of course, the lack of such specialists is because addiction at NJ was not understood as a biopsychosocial illness, but as a spiritual problem or a spiritual battle that one faces. The lack of doctors, psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers at NJ points to a particular conception that the students had of themselves as addicts as well as the treatment that they believed they required. In order to illustrate this, I would like to turn to another conversation I had with a student at a different time. After elementary class one day I was sitting by myself by the square, waiting for the next class to begin, some students were playing hand tennis, others were sitting on the benches. I was thinking about how there is no talk about addiction or just drug use in general in any of the classes, when Daniel approached me. Daniel takes a seat next to me, and we talk about rehabs. I ask him what he thinks the difference is between rehabs and NJ. He responds "At rehabs they go more in-depth into your addiction, but that's not always a good thing. It might just end up with you having more problems". I think that the depth of which Daniel was referring to here was a psychological depth, which for many of the students characterised a biopsychosocial approach to the treatment of addiction. At NJ there was no team of biopsychosocial specialists with which one can talk to, which was not problematic as it may in fact lead to having more problems than what one had before.

There was another aspect to the biopsychosocial approach that students did not believe was congruent with the type of person that they were, namely, the type of treatment that they would receive there. During a focus group I had with the NJG students the difference between a rehab and NJ came up. One of the students said "At a rehab centre you have therapists and medication. It's all about you. Here it's not about you." The association of the rehab with "therapists and medication" is related to the biopsychosocial approach, yet what is interesting here is the belief that at a rehab it is "all about you", whereas at NJ it is "not

about you". On the one hand the type of care that students are receiving at NJ is all about them – the individual. The student is at NJ to better their situation by bettering themselves. The primary concern is the individual and allowing them the opportunity to change themselves. Thus, I think that it is safe to say that at NJ it is "all about you" as the individual student. Yet, I think there is a relation of care between the students and the institution that makes it seem as if it is not about the individual. It seems as if it is not about the individual because the emphasis is on disciplining the individual rather than going 'in-depth' into their addiction; there is more of an emphasis on changing the behaviour of the individual than there is on finding out why the individual behaves the way they do. Hence, in a way the discipleship programme is not about the individual in terms of one's psychology or history, but it also very much about the individual in terms of changing the individual's behaviour.

Up until now I have discussed how the students contrasted NJ with the rehab, in terms of depth, that is the rehab is associated with an 'in-depth' investigation into one's addiction, whereas NJ is not. Yet, there was another aspect of the comparison between NJ and the rehab which was more related to effort or comfort. There was a general sensibility among the students that undertaking rehabilitation in a rehab was easier than undertaking the discipleship programme at NJ. In fact, one student even described his time at previous rehabs as a holiday, because he was able to play PlayStation and watch television when he wanted. This is not like NJ, where there is no television and students are kept busy with mental and physical labour all day, from 05:00 until 22:00. NJ is not a holiday, it is hard work. It is as Daniel told me that "all you get here is soup, rice and Jesus Christ". Hence the rehab was spoken of as a place of comfort and even relaxation, and NJ as a place of toil and bareness. The discipleship programme is likened to an ordeal that one must endure, and this was particularly evident when discussing withdrawal and medication.

While there is a three day period at the beginning of the discipleship programme for those suffering from withdrawal symptoms, whereby the student is not expected to partake in the full programme, NJ has no medication to offer students to ease the pain of opiate withdrawal symptoms: such as methadone or buprenorphine. Much like the rest of the programme, the pain of withdrawal was largely perceived as an ordeal that one should endure. However, students were allowed to bring their own methadone or buprenorphine in order to ease their withdrawal symptoms. Thus, interestingly while the rehab was associated with medication, students were allowed to bring their own medication. One day I

thought I would walk over to the section where the animals are kept to pass the time, when I ran into Julian, who at that time was a student of NJB. He was sitting on a tree stump, I sat down next to him and we spoke about many things. At one point in our conversation the topic of withdrawal came up. He told me that he was addicted to heroin and that withdrawal from heroin feels like "Someone is sticking a knife in your belly and twisting it, and you have diarrhoea. After that you still have body cramps, which feels like your bones are aching". At that time I thought that there was no medication at NJ to ease withdrawal symptoms, so I replied that it can be dangerous to go cold turkey. He agreed with me and told me that he had Suboxone (buprenorphine) pills to ease the symptoms. He told me that there is no medication available at NJ but one is allowed to bring their own. He said that he had two Suboxone pills, which he shared with some of the other students.

On another occasion I was sitting in the NJB office speaking with Peter, when a student came in. He looked like he was in a great deal of pain; he was hunched over and speaking in a muffled voice. I could not make out what he said to Paul, another NJB supervisor, who was sitting behind the desk, but after he said it, Paul looked at him for a moment, evaluating the situation. After a moment Paul reached behind him with a set of keys and unlocked a drawer from which he produced a medicine bottle with an orange liquid inside. He poured a slither of the liquid into a measuring cup and placed it on the desk. The student walked up to the desk and bent at the knees so that his eyes were level with the meniscus of the liquid in the cup. He stayed in that position for a while, staring attentively at the contents of the cup, measuring it with his eyes. Finally, he straightened his legs and downed it, and then exited the office. I was amazed by the sheer amount of attention, calculation and reverence given to the orange liquid. Paul noticed my interest and told me that it was methadone.

Conclusion: A particular type of addict

There were particular ideas about who the student was as an addict, among the staff and students themselves. The understandings of staff and students were largely congruent. Overall the addict was thought to be someone whose entire life is controlled by drugs, and if drug addiction was not their primary reason for being at the Ark, then still their particular lifestyle was still thought of as the cause of their situation. For the staff the students' life was characterised by an inability to perform one's responsibilities, particularly one's responsibilities towards one's family and work. Interestingly this inability to perform one's

responsibilities was not so much attributed to the drugs themselves, but rather to an attitude. An attitude characterised by a lack of a desire to progress in life, that is, what was thought of as the 'normal' progression of life. Rather than pursuing the 'normal' progression of life, students were spoken of as being too dependent on other people (especially their parents) and manipulating others in order to get what they want.

For the students themselves they had a similar conception of themselves as particular types of addicts. They associated the rehab with particular things and then contrasted this with NJ in order to give a sense of the type of person they had become and the type of treatment they believed was best for them. Overall, they distinguished NJ from the rehab according to two themes: depth and comfort. The rehab was spoken of a place which provides 'in-depth' treatment for one's addiction; that is a place characterised by a team of specialists with which one can talk with. The 'depth' of the rehab was not spoken of as something particularly useful in their recovery, as something which at least for one student my lead to more problems than solutions, and in general something which had no effect at all. The rehab was also spoken of as a place of comfort and even relaxation; as a place where everything was focused on the individual patient. Students did not believe that this type of care was particularly useful for them because it is similar to the sort of care and freedom that they believed was the very cause of their situation. Overall, we find a common trajectory among the student of NJ of having been to many rehabs and other institutions in the 'carceral network' (Foucault, 1975) before coming to NJ. Specifically, when speaking about rehabilitation the idea of particular types of treatments working for particular types of people came through.

According to Nancy Campbell (2010: 99) "treatment modalities operate, often at odds with one another, as a set of ideological codes to which proponents must adhere if they are to get well". The students' seemed to be well aware of this, as through comparing NJ with rehabs they were highlighting particular 'ideological codes' that were present in each form of treatment modality or form of care. The form of care that one received at a rehab was not the type of care that the students were seeking. The students thought of themselves as particular types of people and the rehab as providing a form of care that would not help them. For Foucault, "as there are different forms of care, there are different forms of self" (1988: 18); the students were constructing themselves as particular types of people in relation to a form of care that they thought they needed. In discussing how people are

made up, Hacking mentions two vectors: “the vector of labelling from above, from a community of experts” and then “the autonomous behaviour of the person so labelled” (2004: 111). It is a partial framework for Hacking, but I think the way in which students were spoken about as particular types of addicts by the staff members and spoke about themselves as requiring a particular type of care exemplified this aspect of making up people quite well. It is not only that the category of the addict was imposed on students by staff members, but the students had their own ideas of who an addict was as well.

Chapter 5: The broken person

In the previous chapter I discussed how the students were spoken about and how they spoke about themselves as particular types of addicts. In this chapter I introduce the reader to another popular category that students used to refer to themselves – the 'broken person'. The broken person was different to that of the addict, as the category of the broken person did not solely place the responsibility for one's predicament on the individual but was more willing to take into consideration the influence that others have in an individual's life. In particular, the concern with 'worldliness' and society as an immoral place, which has in part broken the student, is what characterises the broken person. Whereas the addict did not subscribe to the norm of performing one's responsibilities, and was in a way abnormal; the broken person became broken by conforming to what was happening around them, so that to be a broken person was not something abnormal like being an addict, but rather an expected outcome of conforming to an immoral society.

In discussing a particular addiction treatment programme in the USA, Summerson Carr mentions that "recovery is a matter of coming to terms with the self that is denied in active addiction" (2006: 636). Interestingly, there was a similar sensibility at NJ, as there was a discourse concerned with how the student was not who they really are while they were an addict and were learning who they really were at NJ. It is similar in the sense that there was a concern with a loss of self in active addiction and a rediscovery of that self in recovery. However, what was different about NJ was that it was not concerned with getting the students to confess that they were addicts, but rather to get them to not think of themselves as addicts; the addict was the person that entered the programme, the person that had to be changed. For Foucault (1997: 285) "care of the self is, of course, knowledge of the self", as well as "knowledge of a number of rules of acceptable conduct". This is not to say that Foucault here was arguing for care of the self as knowledge of the self, but rather he was arguing that care for the self, had at some point in history become equated with knowledge of the self, so that care of the self was tied to the pursuit of the truth of oneself. Throughout this chapter I want to draw attention to the way in which conforming to one's environment can cause one to lose their sense of self. It highlights the ways in which "norms [are] not simply a social imposition on the subject but constitute the very substance of her

intimate, valorised interiority" (Mahmood, 2005: 23), so that by conforming to particular norms one may in fact be shaping their self in particular ways.

Learning to be a broken person rather than an addict

While the student was an addict with a bad attitude before coming to the Ark, this is not really who the student is. The addict is, as Peter put it "the thing that comes in here". The student then learns that they are not really an addict but a 'broken person'. During Disciples Class the teacher says to the students "when we come here we are broken people". I could not have put it so succinctly myself. The title of the lesson was 'the principle of sewing and living being', and throughout the lesson the teacher referred to the broken person. Again she proclaims to the class that "we did not know or admit that we were broken when we came here", yet students arrive at NJ as broken people. The teacher is trying to get the students to think of themselves as a particular a type of person – a broken person. This is not a person who they become once they enter the Ark, but rather it is someone who they could not know or admit they were before coming to the Ark. Hence, the student was already a broken person before coming to the Ark, but it is only through being at NJ that they were able to admit that they were broken. There is a distinction here between who we are and what we know about ourselves, a distinction between the ontology and epistemology of being broken. In this case, the ontology of being broken is relatively stable, in that the person was and still is broken when they come to the Ark. The epistemology of being broken changes, in that the individual did not know they were broken, but the student does. The student is able to know her/himself as a broken person, and admit it as well, because he/she is in an institution which enables him/her to do so. Importantly, the institution is not framed here as that which has created the category of the broken person, but rather as a place which has given a name to a person who already exists; it merely provides the student with the opportunity to know themselves as they really are. A person who they could not admit they were because they could not access the truth of who they really are.

While students did refer to themselves as addicts, the category always carried a negative association, and as such it was a category that they wanted to distance themselves from. While speaking with Julian on the tree stump about rehabilitation, he told me that he did

not like the idea of “once an addict always an addict”, which he said one learns in rehabs. He even found it laughable and self-defeating to always think of oneself as an addict. It ties in with what he told me earlier in the conversation that he believes that he is inherently good, and everything bad in him comes from somewhere else. He qualifies this by telling me about the ‘fruits of the spirit’, which according to him entails the way in which God has sown in us seeds of the spirit from which all the good things come, that is joy, love, etc. These seeds reside in our heart. However, these seeds can be replaced by bad seeds. We should not allow bad seeds in our heart because they will bear evil fruit. Such seeds come from keeping company with evil people, but we also have the choice of whether we allow such seeds into our heart or not. Thus, always being an addict was something that was not congruent with his understanding of himself at that time, as it went against his understanding of himself as an inherently good person. We can see here that being an addict was something that he became by allowing bad seeds into his heart, rather than allowing his essentially good nature to come through by cultivating the seeds of the spirit.

It was not only Julian who did not want to think of himself as an addict. During fieldwork I met a NJB student who I call Andrew, and spent much time with him. I was able to observe Andrew move through the discipleship programme, as when I started he was just a student, then a monitor and finally at the end of fieldwork he was no longer a monitor but was put in-charge of looking after the animals. His responsibilities included feeding the animals as well as cleaning their pens and doing any maintenance that had to be done. As at that time Andrew had completed the discipleship programme and thus did not have to attend classes during the morning, we spent a lot of time conversing, he would often tell me what was happening in the Ark – the gossip. On one particular day we were talking about addiction and I asked him whether he considers himself to be an addict. His response was that he was an addict but not anymore, that he cannot get stuck in his old ways of thinking about himself. It is not only that Andrew does not consider himself an addict anymore but I think more importantly he speaks about it as how he might have thought of himself before coming to NJ, and as a way of thinking about himself that he felt he had to distance himself from in order to change. I find this interesting because whereas Julian spoke about himself as not an addict as something which he knew to be true, Andrew seemed to speak about the way in which he thought about himself as more of a tactic than as really referring to

something true. Andrew spoke about how he thought of himself as producing particular effects and thinking of himself as an addict produced an effect in him that he did not want.

The primacy of perception in one's sense of self

In returning to what Julian said about the 'fruits of the spirit', I found it interesting that he mentioned how bad seeds come from keeping company with evil men, yet it also depends on the individual to allow such seeds into their heart. This reminds me of another conversation I had with the students in the square. The students were telling me about how the devil makes "bad things seem good", one student even said that he "turns black into the new white". In order to justify his argument, the student told me to look at society, that I should just look at what is on the television today, that I will find a lot of promiscuous woman. I replied asking him if TV is bad? A student I call Kenan responded by saying "Yes, the devil works through the media". This was an interesting association of society with what one sees and hears on television, as well as an association of the media with the devil and hence society as something evil. This is clear enough, yet Kenan then added "it really depends on the perspective of the person watching TV".

Just like how Julian alluded to the way in which one's environment can have a negative influence on one, yet also depends on the individual to allow such a negative influence into their life; so to Kenan here alludes to a similar understanding, that the "devil works through the media", but it depends on the perspective of the individual as to what effect that will have. This is similar to what Peter said about the students' lives consisting of themselves and their environment, and that they have no control over their environment but they do have control over themselves. While for Peter he repeated over and over again that for him the change that needed to occur was a change of attitude – a sort of positive mental attitude – I think that he, as well as the students, were also referring to not conforming to one's environment. That is, one does not have control over their environment but they do have control over themselves to not conform to their environment. The discipleship programme is concerned with empowering the students by teaching them that they do not need to conform to the environments from which they come, because by conforming they become someone who they are not – an addict.

The problem of conformity

During outreach class one day the teacher was unable to give the class, so Gavin, who was a monitor at the time, gave a testimony. He spoke about many things, but in particular he spoke about the problems he was dealing with at the time and some of the experiences he had been through before coming to the Ark. He began his testimony like this

> "I grew up in Mitchells Plain, in the Cape flats. So, I would be a rude person, in order for the *mense* [people] not to pick on me. I would rather step out of line and become somebody I'm not. But, at the end of the day I was living a lie".

Outreach class is the last phase of the discipleship programme and a student is expected to complete it within two months. It used to entail the students actually going out into the community outside of the Ark and spreading the word of God, but during the time that I was there it was more focused on preparing the student for leaving NJ. It was fitting that Gavin should speak about where he came from as he would shortly be heading back there soon, although during fieldwork that never happened. I have included this excerpt from his testimony in order to provide an example of the type of person an NJB student believes himself to be before coming to the Ark, and how that person is not who they really are. The person who he was is not the person who he truly is, because he pretended to be that person so that he would not be picked on or so that he could fit in. It was because he conformed to his milieu that he became a "rude person", and eventually ended up living a lie. We can think of the "rude person" that Gavin refers to as referring to the addict; that is the person he was before coming to the Ark. The problem of conforming was something that was also spoken about by Peter

> "The bible says don't conform, a lot of the guys when they come here, and then they do the things outside, because everybody that they know smokes drugs, so they smoke drugs. They come here 'oh its church, let me also do some church here'. Hands up, hands clap, amen, hallelujah, praise the lord. Go outside, nobody does that, don't have to do it anymore, 'I will go back to what I used to do'. Because everybody else is doing it".

There is an obvious concern here with conformity. However, unlike Gavin who was concerned with the way he used to conform outside of the Ark, Peter is concerned both with the way in which students conform outside and inside of the Ark. Whereas Gavin spoke

about conformity in a negative sense because it resulted in him not being himself; Peter spoke about conformity in a negative sense because it prevented students from changing. For Peter, completion of the discipleship programme was no indicator of change in the individual student, as one could just follow the rules and do what everyone else was doing, but without the necessary change to the attitude of the student; something which for Peter was beyond the discipline of the programme. With both Peter and Gavin there is a concern with authenticity: Gavin was not being his authentic self because he was conforming and students do not authentically change when they are conforming. Interestingly, it was not so much so that the students did not change because of conformity, but that they did change because of conforming, that is change into someone who they were not. The point of the discipleship programme was to get the students to not conform, according to Peter. Yet, what is the difference between conforming and being who one really is? Is there even a difference? I would like to discuss why the students were unable to admit that they were broken people in order to comment on how conformity was spoken about at NJ.

The light of restoration: The addict was blind

I think it is important to repeat what the supervisor said, that "we did not know or admit that we were broken when we came here". How can it be that the student did not know or was unable to admit that they were broken? I think that in returning to Gavin's testimony we may find a reason why. Throughout Gavin's testimony he spoke of how he was "blind" to everything that was going on around him, because of his lifestyle. He said "because I was aanmekaar [busy] with my vuilis [rubbish] I couldn't see what was going on around me". He told a story of how one night he was at a party where six people were killed, yet he only found out later that night upon arriving home, in order to illustrate how blind he was to his situation. He was particularly adamant about how he was unaware of his family situation and how his actions were negatively affecting them. He spoke about his mother and his sister, and how because she is a single mother he is supposed to be the "father figure". However instead of being the father figure all he did was cause conflict in the home, because he was bringing home "bad spirits" and "filth". He speaks about how his mother did not trust him, and how he never really had a good relationship with his sister.

He speaks about the problems that his mother and sister are going through and how he cannot help them because they do not trust him, but also because he is at the Ark. He spoke

about how his mother is in debt, and he is upset because he has nothing to give her, but also because while he was blind to his family situation he would steal from his mother. His sister is going through puberty and is an attractive girl, and he cannot be there to protect her. This is because he is not at home, but also because he says that he never really formed a connection with her because he used to shove her around. Before coming to the Ark he was blind to the world around him, as he was only concerned with himself but now he has had his "eyes opened", and can be a better son and brother. The paradox is that while he is at the Ark becoming a better person, so that he can be a better brother and son, is that he cannot really help his family until he leaves the Ark.

Just like how Gavin began his testimony by stating that he had to become a "rude person" so that people would not pick on him, which resulted in him "living a lie"; we find here that he was also "blind" to everything that was happening around him, but now he has had his "eyes opened" and can perceive the world and himself as they truly are. Thus, Gavin did not and could not know, hence he could not admit, that he was a broken person because he was unaware of what was happening around him and who he truly was. It was a problem of perception that Gavin was suffering from – he could not perceive the world as it truly was. It is interesting that by conforming to what is happening around one, one can become blind to what is actually occurring, but I think that is exactly what is being described here by Gavin and echoed by other students and staff.

It was not only Gavin who was unaware of what was 'really' happening around him. He spoke about how the neighbours would say that his mother "haar oe toe gehou het […] vir dai vuilis wat daar aangaan" [kept her eyes closed to the rubbish that was going on]. It was not just Gavin that was blind to the "vuilis" that was going on, outside and inside the home, but his mother was also blind. Thus, it was not only because Gavin was blind to his situation that he could not know that he was a broken person, but also because his family was blind to what was 'really' going on. This ties in to what Peter said about the way in which the family of the student contributes to their brokenness, by spoiling their children for example or not providing enough discipline. So, it is not only about the individual student, but there is also a question of the family. In speaking about where they were coming from, a lot of the students were trying to come to grips with the situation they were coming from and how they were going to prevent themselves from becoming broken again when they returned, if they were planning on returning.

The promise of restoration: A nostalgia for a time before brokenness

While becoming a broken person at NJ resulted from conforming to one's environment, there was also a sensibility among the students and the staff that people could be restored to a state before they became broken. It should come as no surprise since the literal translation of the word 'restoration' is the act of restoring something to a previous which is thought to be better than the current state. Much the same way as a car may de-appreciate over time with lack of maintenance and exposure to the elements, I think a similar logic is at play at NJ; whereby the person is thought to become broken over time through lack of spiritual sustenance and exposure to their environment. However, there was a sensibility that every student was once not a broken person and hence was in need of restoration. Interestingly, this fits rather awkwardly with the other dominant term that students would use when speaking about themselves, which was that they were 'born-again'. It is awkward because the idea of restoration implies a sense of returning something (or someone) to a previous condition which is thought to be a better condition. Yet, the idea of being born-again implies a sense of becoming something or someone new. We can think of both terms as good indicators of what is occurring at NJ as students are becoming born-again by seeking to become someone who they were before they became a broken person. They are becoming a different person by seeking to become an idealized form of who they used to be.

This came up a lot when talking with the students and staff, in particular, this came up when the students would discuss their family. A lot of the students were adamant that they came from "good families", which in this case largely referred to how they said that they were taught morals while they were young. The problem was that the student somehow forgot their morals, as Julian told me one day that "the first thing to go when you do drugs is your morals". The same way in which students would tell me that they had vocations and money before losing everything to drugs; they would also tell me that they came from good families and had morals before using drugs. On the one hand, this plays into the tactic of not placing blame on one's environment so that one can take responsibility and be held responsible for their actions. On the other hand, it is also part of the rationality of the discipleship programme that one was once a good person, who can be restored. This became quite clear to me while having a discussion with Julian where he mentioned that he has to become a child again to learn new morals. He was adamant that he came from a

good family and learnt right from wrong as a child which is why he needs to become a child again in order to relearn his morals.

Conclusion: The authentic self

We find here a sensibility that is different to that of the addict as someone who lacks boundaries and needs discipline, although it is related. This sensibility is more accepting of the idea that the student was not totally to blame for their behaviour because they were in essence merely conforming to what was happening around them. Whether this refers to conforming to a family situation, a friend situation or just generally how 'society' is. Yet, I feel that the category of the broken person is a better reflection of how students spoke about themselves and were spoken about by others than the category of the addict. This is of course due to the fact that not everyone at NJ was their because they were addicted to a substance or behaviour; even though the category of the addict was employed by the staff and students frequently when referring to the students in order to refer to a particular type of person, not so much characterized by addiction but rather an attitude.

Importantly, the category of the broken person is also more suited to the task of categorising the students because it does not refer to any particular type of person or special population in the general population, as the category of the addict does. Everyone at NJ is a broken person, yet not everyone is an addict (in the biomedical sense of the category) and there is nothing wrong with that because in fact anyone at any time in their lives can be in a state of brokenness. Rather than getting the students to admit that they are addicts (as a rehab would do), NJ expects students to admit that they are broken and that there is nothing unique about being broken (as there is with being an addict). In a sense NJ seeks to empower the students by normalizing who they are; while at the same time the students are made aware of the abnormal situation that they are coming from. Interestingly, while in the previous chapter I mentioned how the abnormal situation that students were coming from was spoken of by Peter as resulting from being too dependent on other people which resulted in the student not taking responsibility for their own lives; I think that we find here that being too dependent on other people, that is conforming to one's environment, is also spoken of in a negative sense, not so much because it results in one being irresponsible but because it resulted in one not being who they really are. The

student is not really an addict, but in a state of brokenness because they were unable to overcome the negative influences in their lives.

For Mahmood (2005: 22) “norms are not only consolidated and/or subverted […] but performed, inhabited, and experienced in a variety of ways”. In trying to understand the difference between the conforming self and the authentic self, it seems that conformity is not really the difference. Rather, the difference was a type of subjectivity that each self presupposes. The conforming self was conforming because such a person was blind to everything that was occurring around them, yet still perpetuating everything that was occurring. The authentic self that students learn to be at NJ presupposes a type of self that is reflective, someone who is not blind to everything that is occurring around them, but able to maintain a distance from what is occurring around them. The student is still conforming, however she/he is conforming to norms which result in a particular subjectivity that is more desirable. It is not that conforming causes one to lose their sense of self, and as such it is not that norms are merely consolidated or subverted, but rather that conforming to particular norms results in a particular subjectivity. Perhaps the association with conforming to the loss of a sense of self, is based on an association of the self with a private interiority, which can then be lost in merely conforming to what is occurring.

Chapter 6: Born-again

In this chapter I focus on what it is to be 'born-again'. This will not necessarily entail a discussion with regards to what it is generally to be a born-again Christian (if such a discussion is even possible), but rather a discussion about what it was to be a born-again Christian at the Ark. While it was not necessary to complete the discipleship programme to become a born-again Christian, the discipleship programme itself can be thought of as a way of fashioning individuals so that they would come to embody what it was to be a born-again Christian. Thus, I will discuss what occurred at NJ after one had completed the programme. In general, there were two options available to students who had completed the discipleship programme: stay at the Ark and attend bible school classes, whereby one could then become a supervisor, or leave the Ark. One of the important features of life after the programme was the opportunity to form an intimate relationship with a member of the opposite gender, which in a way can be thought of as an important feature of the born-again Christian. I contrast the gender segregation of the discipleship programme with the allowance of intimate relationships after the programme as an indicator of the importance of intimate relationships to the category of the born-again Christian at the Ark.

For Foucault (2007: 85) "disciplinary normalization consists first of all in positing a model", and the norm is precisely that which conforms to this model. Yet, for Mahmood (2005: 22) "norms are not only consolidated and/or subverted […] but performed, inhabited, and experienced in a variety of ways". Thus, we find in Mahmood's thinking a different understanding of the norm and normalization than that found in the work of Foucault, in that Mahmood is more sensitive to the way in which the norm is not merely a model to conform or not conform to, but one can in fact conform in a variety of ways to particular norms. Gender segregation was a norm at NJ, but it was also one of the most debated topics among students. On the one hand, gender segregation was a norm that could either be conformed to or not, and in that way it was more like a model that could either be consolidated or subverted. On the other hand, however, students had their own ideas about gender segregation and relationships which were not in line with the ideas and practices of NJ, but nevertheless were still congruent with how students thought a born-again Christian

should live. Thus, there was a sense in which the norms of NJ were models to either be consolidated or subverted, but also that they could be inhabited in a number of ways.

However, the particular livelihood possibilities available to students were of course limited, so that the particular ways in which students could inhabit norms, while open to contestation, were also limited.

After the programme: The problem of stagnation and waiting

The aim of the discipleship programme was to empower the students by providing them with a way of talking, thinking and feeling about themselves, as well as with providing them with a routine and responsibilities, which empowered them in a more physical way by getting them used to a particular lifestyle. All of these techniques are primarily aimed at making the individual strong enough to survive in the world without becoming broken again. Yet, a vast number of students never left the Ark or did leave and returned. Why did this occur? Everybody has their own life trajectory and of course there are similarities between trajectories. In some cases people follow a similar trajectory, as was the case with many of the students by merely being at the Ark, as well as the way in which many of them said that they had been to rehabs before. I cannot say why particular individuals came back to the Ark, that is what occurred after the programme, yet I can discuss what students told me about their reasons for returning or wanting to stay indefinitely.

For many of the students the ‘outside’ was a harsh place where everyone was only concerned with their own wellbeing. During one of the classes the supervisor told the students that she “had to go through the wilderness to now be speaking the gospel”. The wilderness to which she was referring was her pervious life before coming to the Ark. It is interesting because the way in which she spoke about the wilderness associated it with a sort of rite of passage, which allowed her to be at the Ark preaching the gospel. In that way there seemed to be a substitution of what counts as a rite of passage or process of initiation, because it was not that she began a process of initiation once entering the Ark in order to become a born-again Christian, but rather that her whole life before coming to the Ark could be considered a process of initiation in order for her to become a born-again Christian once she entered the Ark.

As her life before coming to the Ark was the initiation then a return to that life may not be desirable, as a rite of passage should ideally only last for a set duration of time and not continue indefinitely, as one would then be in a constant state of liminality or transition. For the supervisor, her life before coming to the Ark entailed a rite of passage so that she could become born-again at the Ark. However, for others being at the Ark itself can entail being in a state of liminality. During projects one day, I joined the students who were busy burning cardboard in big steel drums. I spoke at length with Wayne, who had just completed the programme and was still in the process of deciding what to do next – whether to leave or stay. He said that he did not like how people "stagnate" at the Ark, and even went on to say that "if this is what being a Christian is all about then I don't want to be a Christian". I never saw Wayne again after that and suspect that he left. Andrew on the other hand was not stagnating but waiting. Just like Andrew, many of the students who had completed the discipleship programme and had chosen to stay at the Ark and become a staff member, where in a state of waiting. They were waiting for the right time to leave the Ark, and a common response to asking them when they were going to leave was when God tells them to.

Interestingly, when I mentioned this to Peter, he was not impressed. I thought that he may have taken such an utterance from a student as evidence of change, yet he instead took it as another example of someone who has a bad attitude. He told me that a lot of the students expect God to provide everything for them but that is not how it works. He said that God can only provide what the individual cannot provide for themselves. It is up to the individual to do everything they can to provide for themselves. The statement that the student made was another example of a bad attitude because it was evidence of a lack of initiative by the student, similar to the way in which the student is thought to be before coming to the Ark, that is, relies too heavily on other people and does not take responsibility for their own lives.

It is interesting because the students were interpreting what they were being taught in a way that was not congruent with what the supervisor wanted. In the classroom students were taught "all we have to do is be obedient to God at all times" and "if you trust in God you will never grow weary" and even "God will give you all your basic needs". Hence, it is not surprising that students say things like they are waiting for God to tell them when they need to leave, or their belief that God will provide them with everything they need, even

their material needs. In a sense what the student is speaking about when they make such statements is 'God's will'; that they have surrendered their will to God and are actively trying to do what God wills for them, rather than follow their own will. When asking students how do they know what is God's will for them or what do they feel? Kenan responded by saying that it feels like a voice inside his head, and another NJG student told me it feels like a nagging sensation to do something. It seems to sort of function like intuition and can be thought of as a way to empower themselves by knowing that they can trust their intuition because they have the power of the Holy Spirit within them.

Gender segregation: Practical, social and religious considerations

Yet, as we have seen, merely saying that one is doing something or perhaps more applicable to this discussion, is not doing something because one says that it is God's will is not taken as evidence of it actually being so. In a similar way there were also situations whereby a student interpreted what was said in the lessons as well as what they had read in the bible and other discourses on Christianity, which was not congruent with the staff's ideas or even with the rules of the Ark. No more was this more apparent than with the rules regarding the segregation of male and female students. As I have already mentioned there were particular rules and practices put in place to limit contact between male and female students as much as possible. Yet, something which I have not discussed yet in detail were the ideas concerned with personhood which informed a lot of these prohibitions and practices. In particular, the male and female segregation was in part informed by practical, social and religious reasons.

When asking Pastor Hannah why there is segregation between the male and female students, she responded that it is because of practical concerns. The practical concerns she listed was that of a concern with that if they allow contact between the male and female students then there would be sexual intercourse which would then lead to pregnancy and more people at the Ark. Hence, the segregation of male and female students was put in place to limit the possibility of there being too much people at the Ark than they could effectively handle. Furthermore, there was also a concern with domestic issues that might arise from such contact. She provided me with the example of something that occurred a few years ago. She told me that there was not always segregation between the male and female students. A couple of that time decided to claim squatter rights on the Ark's

premises. The pastor says that they did this because they did not want to work, but still wanted to stay at the Ark. The Ark won the case, but since then there has been segregation between the male and female students. Either way, we find that the reason for the segregation is based on the idea that if there is contact then relationships will form. For the pastor it is largely a practical concern.

For Peter it is also a practical concern, but just as he had particular ideas about the social context from which the students were coming from, so he also had ideas about the social reasons for why the male and female students were segregated. For Peter there had to be segregation between the male and female students because of the type of people he considered them to be. He told me that the male students are rough with women, and that because of this they need to be kept separate from the female students.

> "A lot of these girls… they ah, how can I put it man, they need protection. Cause these guys, have you ever seen these guys with women? They rough with women. You know? That guys is rough. They rough with women. That's how they know to treat women. It's now baby this, baby that, and later it's ditditditdit [the sound of hitting something]. These girls have enough problems like that, they been abused, raped, you know whatever".

It is partly because the NJB students are thought to abuse woman that they keep male and female students segregated, as well as the idea that most of the NJG woman have been abused by men before, and in fact may be one of the main reasons for why they are there, hence the Ark believes they are protecting the woman from abusive men. The NJG students echoed this sentiment by also claiming that most if not all of the NJB students were rapists and abused woman; however, albeit not surprisingly, all of the NJB students with which I spoke with told me that they did not abuse woman. When I asked Kenan about this, he even went so far to tell me that he thought of himself as a "defender of woman", which relates to his own life whereby he told me that he was protecting his mother and his daughter by leaving their home in Port Elizabeth. Yet, how can it be that all of the NJB students were thought of as rapists and woman abusers? I think it is another example of the particular ideas of the addict, as the type of person that goes to the Ark, although this idea is more related to idea of who the NJB students are based on where they are coming from.

Of course, there are religious reasons as well why there is segregation between the male and female students. Yet, just like the so-called practical concerns, the religious observances inform and are also informed by particular ideas of who the students are. As I mentioned in a previous chapter there is a sign that hangs in the NJB office which states "I made a covenant with my eyes not to look lustfully at a young woman". This provides a sort of religious justification for the segregation; that NJB students should not even look at NJG students because they cannot do so without lust, which of course assumes that the NJB students cannot look at a woman without lecherous thoughts. This means that the chance of having sex is almost guaranteed because of the assumed inability of the male students to control their lust, and as sex before marriage is prohibited in Christianity this means that both the male and female student run the risk of committing a sin by having contact.

It was not only the NJB students that were held accountable in the type of person who they were thought to be when it came to justifications for the segregation; the NJG students were also implicated in the practice. As according to Peter

> "It's like, some of these women, you smile at them, you smile 'hello, how you doing?' And that's it. 'I am in love with that dude. I am head over heels for him'. She never experienced something like that. Somebody speaking to her nicely, like she's a human being. Not somebody, a male. [Not] even her parents, even her father, her brothers, speak to her like that. Even her brothers will give her a *klap* [smack] now and then. She'll be older than them and he'll still be *klapping* her. Now you come along, with your smile and your green eyes
>
> 'how you doing?'
>
> 'I'm in love'.
>
> And again, they also got their *gedagte* [thoughts]; relationship is sex. And they don't know about protection".

While the male students are thought of as women abusers, the female students are thought of as sort of naïve, and both male and female students are spoken of as associating relationships with sex. While there was an effort to limit contact between male and female students, there was still much talk about relationships between the opposite genders, inside and outside of the class. In fact, one class consisted almost entirely of a discussion between

the students and the supervisor about relationships. During this discussion an NJB monitor told the class that they are there to focus on themselves and that they need to work on themselves before they can start a relationship. This was a common sentiment among students and staff members and was often given as the reason for why there is segregation between the male and female students. Another common sentiment that was expressed in this class, and elsewhere, was that if one loved another then they would not mind waiting until marriage to have sex. Everyone in the class seemed to agree. It was interesting though because there was not only talk about what is right to do but there was also talk among the students about how they used to be. For example, an NJB student mentioned how he used to "use women for sex". The way in which discussions in the classroom would entail speaking about what is right, as well as what is wrong by citing examples of how one used to be was a common occurrence in all the classes. However, not all the NJB students were in agreement to what had been said.

Love is the cure: Kenan and his girlfriend

After the class I joined the NJB students as they were occupied with burning old cardboard and paper for projects. I spent some time speaking with Kenan. We were discussing relationships when he told me that he has a girlfriend (Aimee) in the Ark. He met her while he was a monitor as then he did not have to bow his head so he was able to see her. Interestingly, both Kenan and his "girl" as he called her were in that same class which I mentioned above. When the NJB student said that he used to tell women that he loved them in order to have sex with them, Kenan responded by saying that he never did that, that he would only tell a woman that he loved her if he really did. Of course, we can question the motivations for why he said it, as his 'girlfriend' was in the same class. Yet, in talking with him he seemed adamant that he did not only like her but was in love with her. Kenan was found out, when his girlfriend fainted one day and he sent a message with one of the NJG students to ask if she was alright. After receiving the message the NJG students reported Kenan to one of the supervisors, and both he and Aimee were called into a meeting with Janet, Michelle and Peter. Kenan referred to this meeting as "court".

During the meeting Kenan told me that he confessed to his attraction to Aimee, which he was particularly proud of, as he told me that he could have just lied but that "would not have been the Christian thing to do". He did not feel guilty for what he had done as well

because he told me that “love is the cure” and “God is love”. Hence, Kenan was making use of the same discourse in order to justify his actions. It was a viable tactic because there was already a tension at the Ark between what the bible says and what the students referred to as “man-made rules”. The prohibitions concerning contact between male and female students was an example of what was meant by “man-made rules”, and as a ‘manmade rule’ it was ideally inferior to Christian doctrine. Yet, practically the rules of the institution were not inferior to doctrine and Kenan was placed on lockdown because of the incident, and Aimee had to begin the programme again.

Kenan did not only provide a religious justification for his actions, but also a ‘social’ justification. Kenan often told me that he was not at NJ for a drug problem but primarily to escape a life of gangsterism in Port Elizabeth. Whether he had a drug problem or not, he was primarily at the Ark to start a new life in a different province, what he referred to as “establishing” himself. He said that his relationship with Aimee gave him something to look forward to, that it gave him hope. There was a sense in what Kenan was telling me in that what was the point of being at NJ and going through the programme if it did not lead to starting a new life in the Western Cape. Kenan would often tell me that he did not know anyone in the Western Cape, and that he was not able to go out for weekend passes because he did not have anywhere to go, and his relationship with Aimee was spoken about as a sort of way of ‘establishing’ himself in a new province. However, it must be noted that Andrew told me that Kenan did take weekend passes, so it is difficult to say whether he really was ‘stuck in the Ark’ as he wanted me to believe. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that Kenan was primarily concerned with starting a new life in the Western Cape and thought of his relationship with Aimee has a perfect way to do so, perfect because he mentioned how he was and wanted to work as a barber and coincidently Aimee was a hairdresser, thus a sort of ideal pairing or a way for him to establish himself. We find here that while ‘God is love’ and love is then rationalized as a ‘cure’ for a spiritual malady; love was also rationalized as a ‘cure’ for his material needs.

Romantic relationships: An archetype for students

When looking at the lives of students who had completed the discipleship programme, as well as bible school and were now living and working at the Ark as a supervisor, something that becomes apparent is the way in which such individuals were allowed to have

relationships. As the segregation between male and female students was an important feature of the discipleship programme; so, the allowance of male and female staff members to have relationships was an important feature of life in the Ark after the programme. I have already mentioned Pastor Hannah and her husband, but Peter and Michelle were also married to their respective partners and living in the Ark. Both Peter and Michelle also met their spouses in the Ark and there was a particular process that one had to undertake in order to have a relationship in the Ark.

In order to begin a relationship both individuals had to have permission from those in a higher authority position, i.e. a pastor. In order to detail the process I will refer to conversations I had with both Peter and Michelle, as both supervisors were at the time of fieldwork living with their spouses at the Ark. Both Michelle and Peter's accounts were fairly consistent with regards to the actual process. The first step in the process (apart from developing an attraction to someone else, itself something we find is constrained or determined in part by one's place at the Ark) is getting permission from a pastor, in particular, it seemed that Pastor Hannah was responsible for this. During my interview with Michelle she told me that she developed an attraction towards a male staff member. She then went to her supervisor and told her about it. This was after completing the discipleship programme. Her supervisor than arranged a meeting between Michelle, the supervisor, Pastor Janet and the male staff member who Michelle had an attraction for. The staff member who Michelle was attracted to had no idea before the meeting, and during the meeting Michelle told him how she felt about him. The feelings were reciprocated, and a document was drafted explaining to Michelle and the guy the process that they would now have to follow in order to have a relationship.

The peculiarity of the situation was not lost on Michelle. We found the formality of the whole situation quite comical, that the guy was called into a meeting for Michelle to tell him that she was attracted to him, and that he had no idea of this before the meeting. Michelle also mentioned the sense of vulnerability that arises in such a situation, that, what if she told her supervisor about her feelings and then the person did not feel the same way? After the pastor and the supervisors agree that a relationship can begin, the individuals must then go through a process whereby they are not allowed to have contact with each other for six months. There were some discrepancies between Michelle and Peter's account of exactly how long this stage lasts, as Michelle told me that there is first a six month long phase

where the individuals may not see each other or be seen together in the Ark, yet they are allowed to be together outside of the Ark, to go on dates for example. This is then followed by another six month long phase whereby the individuals may not have any contact whatsoever, after which they can then make their relationship official and be known as a couple in the Ark.

According to Peter however, he did not mention a year-long process divided into two phases, but rather spoke about the process as being about a year in duration whereby the individuals are not allowed to be known in the Ark as a couple, but are allowed to be together outside of the Ark. Either way, we find that in both Michelle's and Peter's accounts that the process is characterised by controlling the amount of time that the individual's spend together and more importantly, is primarily concerned with keeping the relationship not visible to the other people of the Ark, until it is 'official' which can only be established after six months or a year. There were two primary reasons given by Peter and Michelle for why one must undergo this process. The first reason was that it provides some sense of assurance that the two individuals are actually attracted to each other and want a relationship, rather than just looking for sex. In this sense, the process is thought to discourage those who are only seeking sex rather than a relationship because of the amount of time that it takes to become an official couple, as well as the difficulty involved in trying to see each other and the limited amount of time that the individuals actually get to spend together. According to Peter, "If you want a relationship and it's worth it, you won't mind difficulty […] It's even more worth it in the end". There is the sensibility that it should be difficult to start a relationship and that the Ark makes it difficult on purpose, yet this is in the best interest for the concerned parties, which entails the Ark as an institution as well.

The second justification for the process is to ensure that none of the students are aware of the potential relationship or that the individuals are dating. This reason is perhaps a bit more specific to the Ark, as whereas the previous reason is very easily thought of in terms of the Christian prohibition against sex before marriage, this second reason is more easily thought of in terms of thinking about the Ark as a particular type of institution. The reason for this was that if students were aware of a relationship between staff members then they would also want to have relationships. As we have seen there was a sensibility among the staff members that relationships were associated with sex for the majority of the students, both male and female. And again, as I have discussed this was thought of as problematic for

practical reasons – sex leads to pregnancy and pregnancy leads to too many people at the Ark, as well as religious reasons – the prohibition against sex before marriage in the Christian tradition. Thus, we find that after the programme one is in a position to start a relationship with someone of the opposite gender, yet even then they must undergo a particular process/programme, before they can officially be considered a couple.

A part from keeping the relationship hidden from the students in order to reduce the complications that might arise from students having knowledge of it, there was another reason, which I have already mentioned in relation to the prohibition against relationships between students, which was that of the sensibility that students are at NJ to work on themselves, and that a relationship would make such work more difficult than it already was. Thus, we can think of the ability for one to start a relationship after they have completed the programme and bible school, as an indication that perhaps the individual has worked on him/herself sufficiently and as such is ready to have a relationship. To get to such a state of readiness takes a lot of time, as the discipleship programme is six months long and bible school is three years long, and even such a long duration one is still required to go through the six month to a year long process before they can become official.

Conclusion: An ethical tradition

While to be a born-again Christian does not necessarily entail the completion of a programme like the discipleship programme of NJ, the discipleship programme itself can be thought of as a way of fashioning individuals so that they come to embody what it is to be a born-again Christian. The strict gender segregation during the programme, and the possibility of having a romantic relationship after the programme were important concerns for both students and staff members. The practices of gender segregation were rationalised according to particular ideas that the staff members had of students as particular types of persons – NJB students were women abusers and NJG students were naïve. The segregation was spoken about as an example of man-made rules, which was and was not in tension with the rules and norms of Christian scripture and teachings. It could be justified by the prohibition against sex before marriage as found in Christian discourse, albeit by making recourse to speaking about the students as particular types of persons. Yet, it could also be subverted by recourse to Christian scripture, as Kenan did. Interestingly, what one chose to do after the programme or the possibilities that were available to them, was also spoken

about as a tension between staying at the Ark or leaving. The tension was framed as a question of whether the student would be able to not become a broken person again once they left the Ark.

The same way in which the categories of the addict and the broken person opened up particular possibilities of personhood, so the category of the born-again Christian also opened up possibilities of personhood. For Mahmood (2005: 29) “the individual is contingently made possible by the discursive logic of the ethical traditions she enacts”. The logic of restoration made it possible for students to become the person who they were before they became a broken person by becoming born-again. Furthermore, with regards to an ethical tradition, it was not as if Christianity was the only ethical tradition present at NJ. While many of the practices, ideas and categories were informed by Christian discourse, there were also other ethical traditions being enacted. There was an ethics at NJ which was informed by and producing a particular knowledge of the students as particular types of persons. That is “ethics not as a set of regulatory norms, but a set of practical activities that are germane to a certain way of life” (Mahmood, 2005: 27). The category of the born-again Christian at NJ was characterised by a number of regulatory norms and practical activities, which was informed by Christian discourse as well as a knowledge of the students as particular types of persons.

Conclusion: Christian restoration and the discipleship programme

Christian restoration and the discipleship programme were concerned with fashioning born-again Christians. The logic of restoration was characterised by a concern with and a belief in the possibility of restoring someone to the person who they were before they became a broken person. This was achieved through the discipleship programme, which provided the students with routine and responsibilities, as well as with particular ways of thinking and talking about themselves. The discursive and non-discursive practices of NJ were informed by Christian discourse and a discourse concerned with the student as a particular type of person coming from a particular social context. This person was someone with a bad attitude, who lacked discipline, but also someone who in some ways was a victim of the harsh environment in which they found themselves before coming to the Ark. The harsh environment refers to a knowledge that the staff members had of the student's social contexts, but also to a rejection of 'worldliness'. In this way, the dire circumstances that many of the students were coming from was intertwined with the particular Christian sensibility of rejecting the 'world' or 'society' in order to be closer to God. At NJ being closer to God or becoming a born-again Christian was a strategy directed towards preventing the individual from becoming a broken person again.

In discussing Pentecostalism's concern with personal and social rebirth David Maxwell (1998: 352) states that it "begins with the remaking of the individual and rapidly progresses to the family". The same can be said about the way in which the discipleship programme was initially and primarily concerned with the individual but directed towards the establishment of a stable domestic life. While some of the students did have families to go back to, many of the students did not have a stable domestic environment to return to after completing the programme. The Ark was well aware of this, which is why students were offered the option of staying at the Ark. This all begs the question of what restoration was really directed towards, as one might assume that restoration was directed towards reintegrating the individual back into 'society'. Yet, students were taught that they should not conform to what was happening outside of the Ark, as this was one of the causes of their destitution. In discussing the discontinuity between one's past life and new life as a born-again Christian, Maxwell mentions how "ascetic codes and disciplines are important for maintaining that discontinuity" (1998: 185). Hence, while the discipline of the

discipleship programme was primarily directed towards fashioning born-again Christians, it was also an important way of maintaining the discontinuity between a student's past life and their new life; a sort of livelihood which for a number of students would be impossible to maintain outside of the Ark.

Similar to the way in which Mahmood seeks to question liberal assumptions of agency in *Politics of piety*, James Ferguson questions liberal assumptions of freedom and autonomy in *Give a man a fish*. Particularly, Ferguson questions the way in which the "emancipatory liberal mind" associates "dignity and freedom" with "autonomy and independence" (Ferguson, 2015: 143). In a way, Christian restoration at NJ did associate dignity with autonomy and sought to make the students independent from the lives they were living before coming to the Ark. In this way there was a feature of what Ferguson calls liberal thinking at NJ. This is particularly salient by the way in which *skarreling* was interpreted as a problematic activity. Yet, it is not that NJ sought to make students independent of all dependencies. In becoming a born-again Christian one changes their dependencies, as Maxwell states "through continuous involvement in religious, social and welfare activities centred upon the church" (1998: 353). The fact that many students chose to stay at the Ark or returned to the Ark meant that many students developed a relation of dependence on the institution, which to the liberal mind may seem like a relation of unfreedom, or even an undignified way to live. Yet, the work of Mahmood and Ferguson makes us aware of the assumptions one is making in thinking like that. Perhaps the Ark as an institution was the only opportunity for some to live a dignified life, in that besides the material needs that it offered, it also offered the possibility of a form of personhood that was unavailable to most students.

The lack of a direct comparison of NJ with another rehabilitation programme is a possible shortcoming of this thesis, and an opportunity for future research. As an important characteristic of Christian restoration at NJ was the idea among participants that it was not a rehab, but a restoration centre, a direct comparison between NJ and a different rehabilitation programme may provide interesting and useful insights into how addiction is framed and treated in different treatment modalities. In particular, it would be useful to compare NJ to a non-faith-based programme, as one could then compare a faith-based approach and a non-faith-based approach to addiction treatment. This would be similar to the study conducted by Hansen (2013), whereby a faith-based and non-faith-based

approach to addiction treatment were discussed and compared. Furthermore, another important characteristic of Christian restoration at NJ was a discourse concerned with the student as coming from a particular social context. Yet, I was unable to be with the students outside of The Ark, and hence unable to acquire an understanding of the contexts which were so often spoken about and referred to. A possibility for future research would be to 'follow' (Garriott & Raikhel, 2013: 10) particular participants as they complete the programme and leave The Ark, in order to acquire an understanding of the particular contexts which they return to. Such an approach will give a richer understanding of how and why the students spoke about themselves and were spoken about in particular ways. This would be similar to the study that Meyers did in *The clinic and elsewhere* (2013), and may yield interesting and useful insights into how students try to keep from becoming broken again outside of the institution of The Ark.

Bibliography

Asad, T. 1993. *Genealogies of religion: Discipline and reasons of power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Badroodien, A. 1999. Race, Crime, Welfare and State Social Institutions in South Africa from the 1940's. *Social Dynamics*, 25(2): 49–74.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. *Logic of practice*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Burchardt, M. 2013. 'We are saving the township': Pentecostalism, faith-based organisations, and development in South Africa. *Journal of modern African studies*, 51(4): 627–651.

Campbell, N.D. 2010. Toward a critical neuroscience of 'addiction'. *BioSocieties*, 5(1): 89–104.

Canguilhem, G. 2012. *Writings on medicine*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Csordas, T.J. 1997. *The sacred self: A cultural phenomenology of charismatic healing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ferguson, J. 2015. *Give a man a fish*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Foucault, M. 1975. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York City: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the self, in Gutman, H. & Hutton, P.H. (eds.). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, M. 1997. The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom, in P. Rabinow (ed.). *Ethics: subjectivity and truth*. New York: The New Press. 281–301.

Foucault, M. 2007, in A. Davidson (ed.). *Security, territory, population*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 83–110.

Garcia, A. 2013. The elegiac addict, in Garriott, W. & Raikhel, E. (eds.). *Addiction trajectories*. Durham and London: Duke University Press. 36–60.

Garriott, W. & Raikhel, E. (eds.). 2013. *Addiction trajectories*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Hand, S. 1989. *The Levinas reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hansen, H. 2013. Pharmaceutical Evangelism and Spiritual Capital: An American Tale of Two Communities of Addicted Selves, in Garriott, W. & Raikhel, E. (eds.). *Addiction trajectories*. Durham and London: Duke University Press. 108–125.

Jensen, S. 2008. *Gangs, politics and dignity in Cape Town*. Johannesburg: Wits university Press.

Mahmood, S. 2005. *Politics of piety: The Islamic revival and the feminist subject*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Marshall, R. 2014. Christianity, anthropology, politics. *Current Anthropology*, (55)10: 344–356.

Maxwell, D. 1998. 'Delivered from the Spirit of Poverty?' Pentecostalism, prosperity and modernity in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, (28)3: 350-373.

Meyers, T. 2013. *The clinic and elsewhere: Addiction, adolescents, and the afterlife of therapy*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Patel, L. 2008. Getting it right and wrong: An overview of a decade of post-apartheid social welfare. *Practice: Social work in action*, 20(2): 71–81.

Thornton, R.J. 2017. *Healing the exposed being: A South African ngoma tradition*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Ross, F.C. 2015. Raw life and respectability: Poverty and everyday life in a postapartheid community. *Current Anthropology*, (56)11: 97–107.

Seekings, J. 2002. The broader importance of welfare reform in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, 28(2): 1–38.

Summerson Carr, E. 2006. “Secrets keep you sick”: Metalinguistic labor in a drug treatment program for homeless women. *Language in Society*, (35): 631–653.

Ferguson, J. & Gupta, A. 1997. (eds.). *Anthropological locations: Boundaries and grounds of a field science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lefebvre, H. 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time and everyday life*. London and New York: Continuum.

Robbins, J. 2007. Continuity thinking and the problem of Christian culture belief, time, and the anthropology of Christianity. *Current Anthropology*, (48)1: 5–38.

Goodfellow, A. 2008. Pharmaceutical intimacy: Sex, death and methamphetamine. *Home Cultures* (5)3: 271–300.

Vrecko, S. 2010. Birth of a brain disease: science, the state and addiction neuropolitics. *History of the Human Sciences* 23(4): 52–67.

Rose, N. 2001. The politics of life itself. *Theory, Culture & Society* 18(6): 1–30.

Hacking, I. 2004. *Historical ontology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hallowell, I.A. 1955. *Culture and experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.